

FACULTY HANDBOOK

PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

UPDATED: 2011, MAY, SEPTEMBER

UPDATED: 2012, JUNE, SEPTEMBER

UPDATED: 2013, MAY

UPDATED: 2015, OCTOBER

UPDATED: 2017, MAY, DECEMBER

UPDATED: 2018, JANUARY, AUGUST, DECEMBER

UPDATED: 2019, DECEMBER

UPDATED: 2020, OCTOBER

UPDATED: 2021, JANUARY

UPDATED: 2022, JANUARY, FEBRUARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.....	8
Section 1: Vision, Mission, Values Statement.....	9
Vision, Mission, Values Statement.....	9
Declaration of Values – E.P.I.C.....	9
Section 2: Statement of Commitment to Diversity and Multiculturalism.....	10
Statement of Policy on Discrimination and Harassment	10
Sexual Harassment.....	11
Section 3: School Policies Regarding Appointments, Review, Promotion, Tenure, Termination, Denial of Promotion, and Related Appeals.....	12
Preface.....	12
Tenure Track Faculty	13
Appointments to the Tenure Track	13
Professor	13
Associate Professor.....	14
Assistant Professor.....	14
Procedures for Initial Appointments.....	15
Oversight of the Initial Appointment Process.....	15
Process.....	16
Documents and Credentials Required.....	16
Additional Policies Regarding Terms and Conditions of Appointments.....	20
Appointments with Tenure	20
Probationary Appointments	20
Joint Appointments	20
Part-Time Appointments.....	20
Leaves of Absence	21
Sabbatical Leaves.....	21
Other Leaves of Absence	21
Appointments to Positions Paid from Grants and Contracts	22
Changes in Appointments	22
Annual/End-of-Term Review, Mock Review, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures.....	23
Preface.....	23
Annual Review for All Tenure Track Faculty	23
End-of-Term Review of Tenure Track Faculty	24
Oversight of the End-of-Term Review Process	25
Timing of the End-of-Term Review	25
Documents to be Submitted by Candidate.....	25

Process for Review	26
Timetable	27
Mock Review	28
Promotion Review for Tenure Track Faculty	29
Application of Promotion Criteria	30
Promotion to Professor with tenure	30
Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.....	32
Oversight of the Tenure and Promotion Process	34
Initiation for the Review for Promotion.....	34
Submitting a Dossier before Mandatory Review or Customary	
Promotion Review Cycle	35
Documents to be Submitted by Candidate.....	36
Process for Review	38
Timetable	41
Termination of Appointment, Denial of Promotion and Tenure, the	
Appeal Process, and Academic Appointments	43
Preface.....	43
Termination or Notice of Non-reappointment	44
Academic Appointments: Pay Schedules – Resignation/Termination	
– Benefits	44
Provision of Regents’ Bylaw 5.09	46
Denial of Promotion and Tenure and the Appeal Process	46
Clinical Track Faculty.....	47
Definition of Clinical Practice	47
Faculty Practice.....	47
Expectations and Requirements.....	47
Faulty Practice Options.....	48
Appointments to the Clinical Track.....	51
Clinical Professor.....	52
Clinical Associate Professor	52
Clinical Assistant Professor	53
Clinical Instructor	53
Procedures for Initial Appointments.....	54
Oversight of the Initial Appointment Process.....	54
Process	54
New Appointments	57
Transfer Appointments	57
Documents and Credentials Required.....	58
Additional Policies Regarding Terms and Conditions of Appointments.....	62
Probationary Appointments	62
Joint Appointments	62
Part-Time Appointments.....	63
Leaves of Absence	63
Annual Review/End-of-Term Review, Mock Review and Promotion	
Procedures.....	64

Preface.....	64
Annual Review for All Clinical Track Faculty.....	64
End-of-Term Review for the Initial Appointments of Professorial Clinical Track Faculty	65
Oversight for the End-of-Term Review Process.....	66
Timing of the End-of-Term Review	66
Documents to be Submitted by Candidate.....	66
Process for Review	67
Timetable	69
Mock Review	70
Promotion Review for Professorial Clinical Track Faculty.....	70
Application of Promotion Criteria	71
Promotion to Clinical Professor.....	71
Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor	73
Oversight for the Promotion Process	74
Initiation for the Review for Promotion.....	75
Submitting a Dossier for Promotion Review as a Clinical Assistant Professor	75
Documents to be Submitted by Candidate.....	76
Process for Review	79
Timetable	81
Termination of Appointment, Denial of Promotion, the Appeal Process, and Academic Appointments.....	84
Preface.....	84
Termination or Notice of Non-reappointment	84
Academic Appointments: Pay Schedules – Resignation/Termination – Benefits	81
Denial of Promotion and the Appeal Process	86
Research Track Faculty.....	87
Appointments and Promotions to the Research Tracks	87
Research Professorial Track	88
Research Professor.....	88
Research Associate Professor	89
Research Assistant Professor	89
Research Scientist Track.....	90
Research Scientist.....	90
Associate Research Scientist.....	91
Assistant Research Scientist	91
Research Investigator.....	92
Expectations Regarding Appointments and Promotions	93
Research and Scholarly Contribution	93
Independence	94
Service.....	94
Teaching.....	94
Procedures for Initial Appointments.....	95
Oversight for Initial Appointments.....	95

Process	95
Documents and Credentials Required.....	96
Annual Review/End-of-Term Review, Mock Review and Promotion	
Procedures.....	100
Preface.....	100
Annual Review for All Research Track Faculty	100
End-of-Term Review for Research Scientist and Research Professor Track	
Faculty.....	101
Oversight of the End-of-Term Review Process	102
Timing of the End-of-Term Review	102
Documents and Credentials Required.....	103
Process for Review	103
Timetable	105
Mock Review	106
Promotion of Research Faculty.....	107
Oversight of the Promotion Process	107
Initiation for the Review for Promotion.....	107
Submitting a Dossier before Mandatory Review or Customary	
Promotion Review Cycle	108
Documents and Credentials Required.....	109
Process for Review	112
Timetable	115
Denial of Promotion and the Appeal Process	117
Preface.....	117
Denial of Promotion and the Appeal Process	117
Lecturer Faculty	118
Appointments to Lecturer Positions.....	118
Adjunct Faculty.....	119
Appointments to Adjunct Positions	119
Adjunct Professor.....	119
Adjunct Associate Professor	119
Adjunct Assistant Professor.....	120
Adjunct Clinical Faculty	120
Adjunct Research Faculty	120
Visiting Faculty.....	121
Appointments to Visiting Faculty Positions	121
Visiting Research Faculty	121
Appendix A: Grievance Procedures	122
General Principles and Overview	122
Instructional, Clinical, and Research Faculty Grievance Procedures	122
Access to the Grievance Procedure.....	122
Informal Review Process	123

Formal Review Process.....	123
Formal Appeals Process.....	127
Faculty Ombuds	128
What is the Role of the Faculty Ombuds?	128
What Type of Issues Do Faculty Ombuds Handle?.....	128
What if there is a Reason I Don't Want to Use the Ombuds in My Unit?.....	129
Other Resources	129
Appendix B: Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy and Procedures	130
Preface.....	130
Overview and Background	130
Examples of Potential Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment	131
Gifts.....	132
Disclosure, Evaluation and Management of Potential Conflicts of Interest and Commitment	132
Disclosure of Potential Conflicts	132
Management of Potential Conflicts	132
Record-Keeping and Issues of Confidentiality and Privacy	133
Dispute Resolution.....	134
Violations.....	134
Policy Review and Revisions.....	135
Education and Training.....	135
Governing Policies.....	136
References.....	136
Appendix I	138
Additional Examples of Potential Conflicts of Commitment	138
Other Examples of Conflicts of Interest	138
Appendix II	138
Suggested Questions for the Resolution Process	138
Appendix C: Faculty Workload Guidelines	140
General Expectations	140
Teaching Workload.....	140
Scholarship Commitment.....	140
Service Commitment	140
Released Time for Special Initiatives	141
Appendix D: Policy for Faculty Salary Merit Program	142
Purpose.....	142
Eligibility	142
Frequency of Faculty Evaluations	142
Types of Salary Increases	142
No Salary Increase	142
Merit Increases.....	142

Exemplary Performance Bonus	143
Appendix E: COVID-19 Related Clock Extension Request Instructions.....	145
Purpose.....	145
Eligibility	145
Application Statement.....	145
Deadlines.....	145
Addendum: Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Winter 2020	147
Option to Include a Brief Addendum to Dossier	147

PREFACE

The University of Michigan School of Nursing is consistently recognized for high standards of teaching, research, and service. The school's contribution to the health of future generations depends on the continued excellence and superior quality of faculty appointments and promotion.

To assure continued excellence, the Executive Committee promotes these guidelines to assist faculty members in establishing a timely direction for scholarly activity and to facilitate progress toward significant contribution to the nursing profession. These guidelines are intended to move faculty members toward desired appointment and promotion goals consistent with the needs of the profession and the mission of the University of Michigan.

Our strong commitment to diversity and multiculturalism is articulated. Our bylaws and other elements of our solid organizational structure provide a useful and transparent overview from which to work. We believe the contents of this document will be invaluable to members of the School of Nursing community.

For policies applicable to all university faculties, please also refer to:

The University of Michigan Faculty Handbook
<https://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/>

The University of Michigan Bylaws of the Board of Regents
<http://www.regents.umich.edu/bylaws/>

The University of Michigan Standard Practice Guide
<http://spg.umich.edu/>

For additional information on the University's policy regarding professional standards - SPG 201.96, 'Professional Standards for Faculty' - <https://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.96>

Executive Committee
School of Nursing

SECTION 1:

VISION, MISSION, VALUES STATEMENT

Updated and endorsed – February 2022

The mission of the University of Michigan School of Nursing is to advance health for all by educating and developing nurses and other professionals as leaders; generating and applying knowledge; and serving individuals, communities, and populations.

Our vision is to be the world's leading source of high-impact research, evidence and education that will develop the knowledge and nurses necessary to address healthcare's biggest challenges and provide health for all.

Core values that guide our work include:

- Leadership and collaboration
- Diversity, equity, and inclusion
- Integrity and trustworthiness
- Excellence
- Creativity, innovation, and agility
- Respect and empowerment
- Service and compassion

DECLARATION OF VALUES – E.P.I.C.

The School of Nursing is a vital co-created community composed of numerous constituents who work together and individually to enact an environment that reflects our common values. We hold these values to be without question, and every member declares that we:

- **Empower** – each other to interrupt or disrupt disrespect
- **Practice** – communication that is beneficial, kind, and true
- **Inspire** – and be inspired by our members' worth, significance and integrity
- **Cultivate respect** – for ourselves and others routinely, publicly, and privately

SECTION 2:

STATEMENT OF COMMITMENT TO DIVERSITY AND MULTICULTURALISM

As a community of scholars leading society toward the richness of a diverse, global community, all faculty, administrators, students, and staff in the School of Nursing are committed to honoring human diversity and functioning within a global community. It is our policy to promote a safe and responsive environment for all members of our community. We honor a human diversity that is responsive to issues of race, ethnicity, culture, gender, age, sexual orientation, geography, national identity, religion, worldviews, abilities, and social and economic status. We encourage culturally competent and linguistically appropriate exchanges and collaborations among faculty, staff, students, the university, and broader communities.

STATEMENT OF POLICY ON DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT

The school is committed to working with the faculty, staff, students, and administrators to maintain an environment free from discrimination, violence, threats of violence, harassment, intimidation, and other disruptive behavior. Harassing behavior based on race, ethnicity, color, creed, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, ancestry, age, marital status, ability, or Vietnam-era veteran status is a form of discrimination and is prohibited by university policy and the School of Nursing. In the spirit of liberty and freedom of speech, tolerance of different views is protected as long as they are respectfully expressed. While discriminating and harassing behavior are not pervasive in our community, none are acceptable.

Discrimination, violence, threats, harassment, intimidation, and other disruptive behavior in our workplace/community will not be tolerated; that is all reports of incidents will be taken seriously and will be dealt with appropriately. Discrimination behavior can include oral or written statements, gestures, or expressions that communicate a direct or indirect threat of physical harm. Individuals who commit such acts may be removed from the premises and also be subject to disciplinary action, criminal penalties, or both.

Student review process – see Student Handbook

Faculty grievance process – see Faculty Handbook

Designated complaint receivers within the School – Maureen Coerdts and Rushika Patel

Regents of the University of Michigan, Standard Practice Guide

University of Michigan Faculty Handbook

HR/AA <http://www.hr.umich.edu>

SAPAC

Sexual Harassment

It is the policy of the School of Nursing in accordance with the University of Michigan to maintain an academic and work environment free of sexual harassment for students, faculty, and staff. Sexual harassment is contrary to the standards of the University community. It diminishes individual dignity and impedes equal employment and educational opportunities and equal access to freedom of academic inquiry. Sexual harassment is a barrier to fulfilling the University's scholarly, research, educational, and service missions. It will not be tolerated at the University of Michigan or in the School of Nursing. Sexual harassment violates the University's long-standing policy against discrimination on the basis of sex and is prohibited in the employment context by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, in the education context by Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, and, in both employment and education contexts, by Michigan's Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, adopted in 1976.

For assistance with Sexual Harassment Concerns - the Office of Institutional Equity is responsible for ensuring and monitoring compliance with federal and state nondiscrimination laws; however, a discrimination-free environment is the responsibility of every member of the community. The School of Nursing encourages persons who believe that they have experienced or witnessed sexual harassment to come forward promptly with their inquiries, reports, or complaints and to seek assistance. Individuals also have the right to pursue a legal remedy for sexual harassment in addition to or instead of proceeding under this policy. Information about or assistance with sexual harassment issues may be obtained from a variety of University resources:

FASCCO – Faculty and Staff Counseling and Consultation Office

Office: (734) 936-8660

<https://hr.umich.edu/benefits-wellness/health-well-being/mental-health-counseling-consultation-services/faculty-staff-counseling-consultation-office-fascco/fascco-counseling-consultation-services>

SAPAC – Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (Faculty, Staff, and Students)

Office: (734) 764-7771 or 24-hour Crisis Line: (734) 936-3333

www.sapac.umich.edu

University Faculty Ombuds (Faculty)

Office: (734) 763-6576

<https://facultyombuds.umich.edu/>

Report Sexual Misconduct: <https://sexualmisconduct.umich.edu/>

For additional information on the University's policy - SPG 601.89, 'Policy on Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct' - <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/601.89>

SECTION 3: SCHOOL POLICIES REGARDING APPOINTMENTS, REVIEW, PROMOTION, TENURE, TERMINATION, DENIAL OF PROMOTION, AND RELATED APPEALS

PREFACE

The Executive Committee (EC) is a standing faculty committee charged with the responsibility to review all initial appointments for consistency and compliance with university guidelines and School of Nursing requirements for appointments. Appointments are made to the appropriate instructional and research ranks and in the appropriate tenure and non-tenure tracks based upon the requirements of the position being filled, the individual's qualifications, documented recommendations and the approval of the dean with the final decision made by the appropriate university officials. Terms and conditions of every appointment will be confirmed in writing with a copy of the notification of appointment supplied to the appointed individual. At the time of the initial appointment, the head of the unit immediately responsible will see that the new faculty member is appropriately apprised of the criteria and procedure currently in use in regard to appointment, reappointment or notice of non-reappointment, periodic review and evaluation, and promotion and tenure. The School of Nursing is committed to non-discrimination and equal opportunity in implementing its personnel policies. Appointments are made on the basis of individual merit and in the interest of furthering excellence in teaching, research, practice, and service. (See Section 3 of the faculty Bylaws for a description of the responsibilities and composition of the Executive Committee.)

TENURE TRACK FACULTY

APPOINTMENTS TO THE TENURE TRACK

Important information regarding the University of Michigan's requirements and procedures for appointments can be found on the provost's website at:

http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/appointment_guidelines/

and should be carefully reviewed in addition to the School of Nursing information presented below.

In making their recommendation for appointment, the responsible departments and colleges will study the whole record of each candidate. To warrant recommendation for initial appointment, candidates must have given evidence either here or elsewhere of their ability to handle satisfactorily the duties of the positions in question. – *Promotion Guidelines, Attachment A, Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan*

Professor

The title of professor is accorded the individual who has met the requirements for appointment as an associate professor and who has established:

1. A sustained record of excellence in teaching, including experience with advanced students;
2. A sustained and growing record of scholarly eminence which advances the frontier of knowledge;
3. A reputation among the candidate's colleagues and peers throughout the nation and preferably internationally for outstanding and continuing achievements in their field of expertise;
4. A reputation, supported by documented external evaluation, which recognizes the presence of leadership and the quality of research activities, publications, and contributions to the profession in comparison with other professors;
5. A continuing record of recognized accomplishments in academic, professional and community service.

Appointment to the title of professor is made with tenure unless otherwise specified. Both tenure and non-tenure appointments require the approval of the regents on recommendation of the dean, the Executive Committee, the provost, and the president. Initial appointment to the tenure track with the title of professor without tenure is made for a period of up to four years. In the third year of the initial appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided. Successful individuals are then expected to go up for promotion to professor with tenure no later than their seventh year. If unsuccessful in achieving tenure, a terminal year is

provided. Qualifications include the doctoral degree or its equivalent with a proven record of contributions to nursing through research, scholarship, and teaching is an acceptable equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Associate Professor

The title of associate professor is accorded the individual who has met the requirements for appointment as an assistant professor and who has established:

1. A record of excellence in teaching;
2. A distinguished record of scholarly attainment in the realm of scientific investigation, publication, and utilization of research findings in teaching, research, and service;
3. A reputation among colleagues for outstanding achievements and recognized contributions in their field of expertise;
4. An admirable record of academic, professional and community service.

Appointment to the title of associate professor is made with tenure unless otherwise specified. Both tenure and non-tenure appointments require the approval of the regents on recommendation of the dean, the Executive Committee, the provost, and the president. Initial appointment to the tenure track with the title of associate professor without tenure is made for a period of up to three years. In the third year of the initial appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided effective the September following the decision. Successful individuals are then expected to go up for promotion to associate professor with tenure no later than their seventh year. If unsuccessful in achieving promotion, a terminal year is provided. Progression on the tenure track is expected. Qualifications include the doctoral degree or its equivalent with a proven record of contributions to nursing through research, scholarship, and teaching is an acceptable equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Assistant Professor

The title of assistant professor is accorded the individual who has:

1. Demonstrated creative competency in teaching. Possible indicators include:
 - a. Description of student educational and professional accomplishments that serve as indicators of teaching effectiveness (in reference letters or letters of support);
 - b. Service as a teaching assistant, guest lecturer, clinical preceptor;
 - c. Development of educational materials (e.g., patient or family teaching materials, computer-assisted instruction).
2. Demonstrated competence in scholarly activity. Possible indicators include:
 - a. Completion of doctoral dissertation and preferably post-doctoral fellowship;

- b. One (1) or more peer reviewed, data-based publications;
- c. Regional or national research presentations/posters;
- d. Beginning track record of research support (e.g., small grant support, fellowship for dissertation research, NRSA institutional or individual);
- e. Identified program of research.

Initial appointment to the title of assistant professor is made without tenure for a period of three years. In the third year of appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. Successful individuals are then expected to go up for promotion to associate professor with tenure no later than their seventh year. If unsuccessful in achieving promotion and tenure, a terminal year is provided effective the September following the decision. Appointment to this rank is made on recommendation of the dean and Executive Committee. Progression on the tenure track is expected. Qualifications include the doctoral degree or its equivalent with a proven record of contributions to nursing through research, scholarship, and teaching is an acceptable equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS

Oversight of the Initial Appointment Process

The chair of the department is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates at the rank of assistant professor for their department. The department chair and/or search committee chair is directly responsible for contacting a minimum of three (3) professional references provided by the candidate before salary negotiations and/or a contingent offer is provided.

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates at the rank of associate professor or professor with or without tenure across the department in conjunction with the chair of the department. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development does not review the candidate's materials nor does s/he make a recommendation regarding appointment. The department chair and/or search committee chair is directly responsible for contacting a minimum of three (3) professional references provided by the candidate before salary negotiations and/or a contingent offer is provided.

The Office of the Provost faculty appointment guidelines detail procedures for obtaining approval to extend an offer for appointment to the rank of associate professor or professor with or without tenure. These detailed materials must be submitted to the Office of the Provost prior to extending an offer. Following review by the Provost and the President, the Office of the Provost will inform the dean of the decision.

Process

The chair of the department who is primarily responsible recommends candidates for a specific rank and term of appointment to the dean, and forwards their credentials to the HR Office at the rank of assistant professor or the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development at the ranks of associate professor or professor. The final determination of a specific rank and term of appointment will be made at the discretion of the dean based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

If the recommended rank is associate professor or professor with or without tenure the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the department chair, identify at least two (2) senior faculty members at or above the rank being considered who are preferably in the department and on the same track as the candidate. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Together with the department chair, the two (2) senior faculty members will form the review committee and will each independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review regarding the quality and productivity of the candidate justifying the appointment at the specified rank using the school's appointment criteria.

Note: Executive Committee members are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development, the dean and the Executive Committee.

Documents and Credentials Required for Submission to the Executive Committee

All candidate documents noted below are to be submitted in Word format except publications and teaching evaluations.

1. Letter of recommendation from department chair, to include:
 - a. Proposed rank, tenure recommendation (for associate professors and professors), effective date, and term of appointment.
 - b. Substantive description of candidate's work and significant contributions to the field demonstrating that the candidate meets the criteria for the rank sought in regards to teaching, research, and service.
 - c. Description of the appointment in the context of the field and the specific needs of the school.
 - d. Candidate's strengths in relation to the department's instructional and/or research objectives and the role of the candidate in meeting the needs of the program.
 - e. Summary of the search committee's report and evaluations from faculty regarding the candidate's visit and presentation.

- f. Summary of oral references contacted.
- 2. Curriculum vitae of the candidate – with indication of the last time it was updated.
- 3. Publications – Three (3) to five (5) copies of the candidate’s best work/publications (usually peer-reviewed papers), with emphasis on the most recent or most representative since last promotion or appointment.
- 4. Evidence of teaching experience and performance:
 - a. Teaching statement from the candidate.
 - b. Explanation of the teaching evaluation system (for associate professors and professors only) and where the candidate ranks quantitatively in the system. Summaries of evaluations involving ratings as well as student comments can be included; similarly, summaries should be provided for peer evaluations and clinical evaluations, if forms are used for these.
- 5. A research statement from the candidate that includes a statement of impact of his/her research/scholarly work to be the first short paragraph.
- 6. A service statement from the candidate.
- 7. Provide a list of a minimum of three (3) professional references (all ranks) with relevant contact information.
- 8. Letters of recommendation (for assistant professor candidates only) - Three (3) letters of endorsement/evaluation from persons at or above the assistant professor rank should accompany the proposal for appointment and include statements in regard to the following:
 - a. Teaching: A description and evaluation of the candidate’s teaching experience, ability, and reasons for believing the candidate will continue to develop as an effective teacher and scholar.
 - b. Research: A description and evaluation of the quality, originality and significance of the candidate’s research should be included, as well as a description of research in progress. The statement should also include reasons for believing the candidate will continue to develop as an effective researcher and scholar.
 - c. Academic, professional, and community service: A description and evaluation of the candidate’s contribution in areas other than teaching and research. These areas may include administrative responsibilities, leadership positions and participation in professional associations and civic organizations. Professional competence in the field and experience should also be acknowledged.
- 9. List of names of external reviewers (for associate professor and professor candidates only) – The candidate can submit no more than three (3) names of arm’s length external reviewers* who are willing to provide recommendations upon inquiry. It is possible that an additional two (2) arm’s length external reviewer names will be requested from the candidate but should not be supplied unless requested. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided that includes (see ‘Recommended External Reviewer’ form):
 - a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address.
 - b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer’s position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input.

c. Selection rationale.

The candidate may also suggest up to two (2) names with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not be asked to provide letters of recommendation. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individuals.

* All external reviewers must be “arm’s length” and be at or above the rank of the appointment being considered and from schools of similar stature. Emeriti and adjunct faculty are not eligible to serve as external reviewers. Tenure track candidates can only have tenure track reviewers. The University of Michigan policy states that arm’s length reviews should come from individuals outside the present institution of the candidate and from individuals who have not worked or trained with the candidate at other institutions. Close collaborators, present or former advisors/mentors/teachers/supervisors, present colleagues, and close personal friends are not allowed. Co-authors and major research collaborators, or former colleagues are only allowed if it has been more than 10 years since they have worked with the candidate. Letters from persons who have served on a candidate’s thesis or dissertation committee are not considered “arm’s length.” When both an outside reviewer and the candidate are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an “arm’s length” reviewer if s/he and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort (the absence of a direct collaboration must be documented in these cases). The reviewers should be individuals in the relevant field who can critique a candidate’s work and scholarly contributions and be able to provide a truly evaluative and unbiased assessment. The reviews of greatest value are from people who may be unknown to the candidate but have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications.

The candidate will submit no more than three (3) arm’s length external reviewers to the department chair. The department chair, with possible input from the two (2) senior faculty members and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm’s length external reviewers’ names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) arm’s length school recommended external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see ‘Recommended External Reviewer’ form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer’s position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development can add or remove names from the combined list and will approve the initial list, determine who should be contacted for external review letters and will send letters of request to the external

reviewers. The finalized list of external reviewers who will be contacted for agreement to review and write a recommendation letter, have agreed or not agreed to provide a recommendation, and the subsequent recommendations received by the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development will be held confidential for use only during the appointment review process; and no contact between the external reviewer and the candidate should take place.

Review by the Internal Review Committee (for associate professor or professor only):

Once all external review letters have been received and the candidate's dossier is complete, it will be given to the review committee for their evaluation and recommendation. The review committee, including the department chair, will each conduct independent written reviews of the material. The department chair will arrange a meeting of the review committee to discuss their completed reviews, including the external reviewer assessments, and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise. The written reviews of the review committee and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature. All recommendation letters should reflect a candid review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that arose through the review process, include comments from all external reviewer recommendations, address any areas needing improvement and distill to a clear recommendation. All independent recommendation letters will be included in the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee for review and vote.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Review by the Dean and Executive Committee:

The dean and the Executive Committee shall conduct a review of the candidate dossier and the independent recommendations of the review committee members including the department chair. During its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the review committee members, including the department chair to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. During this time, the dean and the Executive Committee may also return a recommendation to a review committee member with specific instructions for further review. The dean and the Executive Committee will then finalize their review and vote on their recommendation. The final School of Nursing decision on the recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absences of all other parties. The HR Office and the Dean's Office will ensure that all required elements are submitted to the Provost's Office, if applicable.

Regents' approval is required for all tenured and non-tenured appointments of professors and associate professors.

ADDITIONAL POLICIES REGARDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENTS

Appointments with Tenure

Appointment to a tenured position implies that the school believes that the candidate is one of the best individuals available and that evidence from external reviewers comparing this person with others in the field is supplied. Moreover, appointment to a tenured position is an indication that the school is confident that the individual's scholarly and professional contributions will continue in this university community. Members of the tenured professorial faculty, which includes only associate professors and professors, shall be appointed by the Board of Regents on recommendation of the dean and Executive Committee and by the provost and president. Unless otherwise specified, professors and associate professors shall be appointed with tenure.

Probationary Appointments

The purpose of a probationary period for untenured appointees is to assess their academic qualifications and performance skills in terms of the expectations and tenure standards of this institution. Non-tenured faculty who are on the tenure-track should be informed by the dean or department chair of the length of the probationary period. Appointments and reappointments during a probationary period should be limited.

Joint Appointments

Joint appointments of faculty members to two (2) or more departments of the university are often negotiated. In fact, it is just such appointments that have provided important cross-disciplinary scholarship and teaching, and which have contributed significantly to the university's stature and reputation in these areas. Departments involved in a joint appointment will have proportional responsibility for the faculty member, agreed upon in advance of the appointment between the faculty member and the responsible departments and reflecting the faculty member's effort or contribution to each of the departments. The salary fraction from each department may be independent of the "effort fraction" because of differing salary scales across departments and colleges. Such an arrangement will be mutually negotiated by all parties involved. The various departments will collaborate and agree on the timing and substance of promotion and tenure decisions. In unusual cases, independent decisions may be reached by the different departments or units that may reflect the faculty member's differing performance in the two (2) or more departments as well as the different criteria for promotion and tenure in those departments.

Part-Time Appointments

An appointment of less than 80% is considered a part-time appointment for purposes of appointment, promotion, and tenure. A part-time appointment, whether an initial appointment or a request for change from full-time to part-time status, will be based upon the needs of the School of Nursing and the individual's qualifications to hold the appointment. All part-time appointments will be reviewed annually by the head of the

immediately responsible unit to determine whether the needs of the school require continuation of the appointment and whether the individual's performance merits an extension of the appointment. If the appointment will not be continued, the individual will be given notice in writing of non-reappointment in conformance with university policy for termination of appointment.

SPG 201.13, 'Rules Concerning Regents' Bylaw 5.09, Tenure, Tenure Review, and Joint or Partial Tenure Appointments' - <http://www.spg.umich.edu/policy/201.13>

Leaves of Absence

Leaves of absence are an important means of promoting the professional development of faculty members. Their teaching effectiveness is enhanced, scholarly activity enlarged, and the institution's academic program is strengthened.

Sabbatical Leaves:

Sabbatical leaves may be granted by the president on recommendation of the dean to members of the tenured instructional faculty who have completed twelve terms (six years) of full-time service in professorial ranks at the university. Complete application for sabbatical leave shall be made in writing and submitted to the department chair and dean no later than February 1 preceding the appointment year within which leave is desired. The application must be accompanied by a statement of a well-considered plan for the sabbatical, which includes its significance as a contribution to the professional effectiveness of the applicant and the best interest of the university and a copy of the faculty member's current curriculum vitae. These applications are reviewed by the Executive Committee. A member of the faculty who is granted a sabbatical leave is expected to return to his/her duties in the university for at least one (1) year. A professor may receive one-half his/her regular salary over the annual contractual period or full salary for one-half of the annual contractual period. Upon completion of the sabbatical leave, the faculty member shall submit a report of the results of the leave within 90 days following return from leave. The report shall be submitted to the department chair, who will acknowledge receipt of the report in writing and forward a copy of the report and acknowledgment memo to the dean and to the HR Office for HR Records & Information Services. It is university practice to grant sabbatical leaves to those who have achieved tenure and who will utilize the leave to enhance their scholarly research and strengthen their academic program.

SPG 201.30-2, 'Sabbatical Leave (Instructional)' - <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.30-2>

Other Leaves of Absence:

Leaves of absence are also granted to non-tenured instructional and research faculty who are in pursuit of professional, scholarly, and research goals which

will be of compelling benefit to the individual and the school. Individuals requesting such a leave of absence, prior to tenure, must specifically request that time away not be included in the eight-year period for qualification for tenure. Leaves of absence will be reviewed and evaluated annually. Leaves of absence without salary may be granted by the president for periods of up to one (1) year. Leaves of absence exceeding one (1) year and extensions of leaves beyond one (1) year for instructional faculty may be granted only by the Board of Regents. Leaves may also be granted for illness, recovery of health, childbearing, and child rearing, and for projected or direct benefit to the institution for public or private service outside the institution. Application for a leave should be made at a reasonable time in advance and through established procedures. The institution is not obliged to assume the financial burden of all types of leaves.

SPG 201.30-1, 'Leaves of Absence without Salary (Instructional)' - <http://www.spg.umich.edu/policy/201.30-1>

201.93, 'Modified Duties for New Parents' - <http://www.spg.umich.edu/policy/201.93>

201.30-4, 'Scholarly Activity Leave' - <http://www.spg.umich.edu/policy/201.30-4>

Appointments to Positions Paid from Grants and Contracts

These positions must be negotiated by the principal investigator with heads of the immediately responsible units and approved through appropriate administrative channels including the department chair and dean. In the event of cessation of funds for appointments to positions paid in whole or in part from grants or contracts for limited periods of time bridging arrangements will be implemented according to university rules, or both service and salary shall be terminated. An individual requesting a change in appointment to a regular instructional faculty will require application to an open position and vetting through the regular open search process with appropriate approvals of the department chair, dean and Executive Committee.

Changes in Appointments

An individual requesting a change in appointment from the regular instructional faculty to a faculty position in a primarily research rank must qualify for the appointment and have a work assignment commensurate with the rank sought. Reappointment to the instructional faculty will be determined at the time of the request based on the needs of the school.

ANNUAL/END-OF-TERM REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Preface

Review, promotion, and the achievement of tenure are never automatic, nor do they simply depend on length of service. These actions require the recommendation of candidates on the basis of demonstrated merit and specific skills and abilities, which are commensurate with the needs of the School of Nursing. Budgetary constraints, program changes, and shifts in student enrollment are factors affecting reappointment. The university endeavors to recognize distinguished performance by adequate increase in salary and by early promotion. It is expected that members of the tenure track will become more effective teachers, researchers, and scholars with experience. Therefore, qualifications for review, promotion, and tenure are progressively more exacting at each rank. Evaluative parameters are further delineated for promotion to professor or associate professor below.

The University of Michigan permits each school and college to adopt policies concerning promotion and tenure reviews for members of the tenure track. Each academic unit may establish its own probationary period, after which candidates for tenure are evaluated and either given notice of non-reappointment or are recommended for tenure. Each may also choose whether or not time spent on various leaves of absence shall be counted toward the school or college probationary period. However, the maximum length of the probationary period of each school and college is limited by Regents Bylaw 5.09 and the university policy on notice of non-reappointment.

Annual Review for All Tenure Track Faculty

The vice president for academic affairs encourages each school/college to make a formal review of faculty members' activities each year. This is regarded as particularly helpful in the case of probationary, non-tenured faculty. Internal annual performance reviews of faculty members are conducted by the department chair and/or the dean. The faculty member has an opportunity to submit material relevant to the evaluation, which documents the individual's accomplishments in regard to academic and professional responsibilities as well as contributions to the broader goals of the school and the university via the faculty productivity report. Decisions regarding reappointments or non-reappointments are communicated to the faculty member according to established guidelines.

The School of Nursing utilizes a faculty productivity report form to capture and evaluate a faculty member's activities over the past academic year and goals for the future academic year, including activities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and disruptions caused by COVID-19. Please contact your department for a copy of this report template.

Yearly, each tenured and non-tenured faculty member is expected to prepare and submit this report along with a copy of their updated curriculum vitae. The department chair

conducts a review of performance, prepares a summary evaluation, and provides a qualitative rating for each faculty member, taking into account academic rank and workload assignment and meets with each faculty member to review performance goals. These finalized reports are submitted to the HR Office and shared with the Dean's Office.

Faculty may use the "Additional Faculty Comments" box on the Faculty Productivity Report Form (Private) to briefly describe (no more than 300 words), how their productivity during the current academic year may have been affected or influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty can describe any areas of impact, including scholarship, teaching, and/or service activities. The description of COVID-19 related influences can remain broad, and faculty are not expected to provide sensitive information, but should capture the reason for the disruption. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- How research productivity was greatly reduced due to laboratory or research unit closure, or shelter-in-home requirements for the research team due to the COVID-19 pandemic
- Having to provide dependent care during the COVID-19 pandemic
- How they or their immediate family required care due to COVID-19 infection
- That they were called to full-time clinical practice during the COVID-19 pandemic

End-of-Term Review for Tenure Track Faculty

Faculty appointed as assistant professors and associate professors without tenure are considered probationary appointments until tenure is achieved, and a successful end-of-term review will be required before an assistant professor or associate professor without tenure can apply for promotion review. For all tenure track appointments, the intent of the end-of-term review is to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or non-reappointment; to assess the progress of tenure track faculty members; and to provide a recommendation to the Executive Committee for review and decision. If the end-of-term is successful, the faculty member will be reappointed for another probationary period and is expected to go for tenure review no later than during their seventh total year in appointment. If the end-of-term review is not successful, written notice will be given to the faculty member noting the fourth year in appointment as the terminal year.

Additionally, the review aims to help faculty members and their department chairs to strengthen academic achievement and productivity during the remainder of the probationary period. The review is an aid for faculty members and department chairs to assess a faculty member's cumulative development and provide guidance for future directions and support for present directions where possible. The review is not as substantial as that for promotion or tenure but is more extensive than the usual annual evaluation conducted by the department chair. The end-of-term is one of several ongoing evaluations for faculty members and should not in any way constrain or influence the formal reviews for promotion and/or tenure. Participation in the end-of-term review process is required.

Oversight of the End-of-Term Year Review Process

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of end-of-term review activities for all candidates across the departments in conjunction with the department chair.

Responsibility for facilitating the progress of faculty toward promotion rests with the department chair. The department chair is responsible for ensuring that fair and equitable evaluation of teaching, research, and service are conducted annually and communicated to the faculty member. The Executive Committee believes a mentoring process is most helpful for individuals as they progress in their careers. However, mentor-mentee relationships emerge voluntarily from situations of mutual benefit to both parties and such relationships cannot be mandated or assigned. The department chair is in a position to advise the faculty member of the qualifications and procedures for promotion and review as well as to determine the candidate's readiness for promotion and tenure.

Timing of the End-of-Term Review

Typically, the review will be conducted and completed at the end of the tenure track faculty member's third year of appointment.

The tenure track faculty member up for end-of-term review should submit a formal notice to his/her department chair and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in writing by February 1 in the faculty member's third year in appointment. The notice will acknowledge that the faculty member will submit his/her materials in accordance with the procedures contained in these guidelines for end-of-term review. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will use this notice to begin the end-of-term review process.

Documents to be Submitted by Candidate for Review

All candidate documents noted below are to be submitted in Word format except publications and teaching evaluations.

1. No later than the last Thursday of April by 12 p.m. the faculty member will submit the following materials via Box, and candidate access will be removed as of that day and time:
 - a. Up-to-date curriculum vitae – with indication of the last time it was updated.
 - b. Self-evaluation – A narrative to include the candidate's: 1) statement of impact of their research/scholarly work to be the first short paragraph of their research statement; 2) teaching statement; and 3) service statement and that addresses the candidate's plans for development and work for the remainder of the probationary period; summary of prior work and accomplishments; and summary of

evidence of teaching performance. Also, include a separate summary teaching table listing scores on key questions (Q1, Q2, Q4, Q199, Q217, Q 230, Q891, Q1631, Q1632, and Q1633) from the course evaluation forms (E & E forms); the actual instructor with comments report (E & E forms) for each course taught; and a supervisory teaching list including doctoral, master's and undergraduate supervision and role for each. The narrative statement should not exceed five (5) pages. It should be single-spaced, in Word format, with 1-inch margins, 11-point font size in Times New Roman font. A limit of five (5) or fewer pages of additional tables and figures may be used to summarize data.

- c. Copies of no more than three (3) representative publications (or those in press) since appointment to a professorial rank within the University of Michigan School of Nursing.
- d. Additional materials as may be relevant to the review; for example, copies of unpublished papers and annual review documents by the department chair of the faculty member.

Process for Review

Submission Requirements:

All faculty will abide by and comply with all submission deadlines. Missed deadlines will halt the process and will jeopardize the candidate's status in the School of Nursing. Only in extreme extenuating circumstances, extensions may be considered upon request to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development from the candidate.

Prior to the submission deadline of materials, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will send out three (3) email reminders to the candidate, copying the department chair:

- The first reminder will be sent two (2) weeks prior to the submission deadline;
- The second reminder will be sent one (1) week prior to the submission deadline; and
- The third reminder will be sent the day prior to the submission deadline.

All required materials are due by the submission deadline. Required materials not submitted by the deadline will halt the process and render the candidate ineligible for review during the current cycle.

As end-of-term review is mandatory, candidates who fail to submit required review materials by the submission deadline will be provided a terminal year. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair via email that the review process has been halted and that the faculty member will receive a formal notice of non-reappointment letter under separate cover, and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office. A meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to discuss the notice of non-reappointment.

Internal Review Committee Selection:

With input from the candidate, the department chair will identify one (1) senior tenured faculty member above the candidate's current rank within the School of Nursing and/or another school/college at the University of Michigan to conduct the review. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Candidates will be informed of the name of their senior. The candidate may also suggest one (1) name with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not to be asked to serve as an internal reviewer. The associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individual. Together with the department chair, the senior faculty member will form the internal review committee, and each will independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review of the candidate's work using the School of Nursing's promotion and tenure criteria. The department chair will notify the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in writing of the senior faculty member selected for each candidate by 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of March.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Note: Executive Committee members and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the dean and the Executive Committee.

Timetable of Review

Review by the Internal Review Committee:

Candidates' materials will be made available to the internal review committee members via Box on or by May 1.

The internal review committee members will each conduct independent written reviews of the candidate's materials. The department chair will coordinate and arrange a meeting with the senior faculty member to discuss his/her completed draft written recommendation and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise. The senior faculty member will be given an opportunity after the meeting to revise his/her draft letter of recommendation. All recommendations will include an assessment of the faculty member's progress to date at the expected level of functioning for the rank including strengths and

weaknesses, the potential for continuing development, any areas needing improvement and a clear recommendation for renewal or non-renewal, along with a rationale. The independent written reviews of the senior faculty member and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature.

The internal review committee will finalize their letters of recommendation and submit their recommendations to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development by deadline. The recommendations will be made available to the dean and Executive Committee via Box by 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of August. At that time, candidates will be informed in writing by the department chair of the recommendation going forward to the Executive Committee. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond to the internal review committee, including the department chair's recommendation going forward and to submit supplemental material prior to their final dossier going to the Executive Committee.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

All independent recommendation letters, the candidate's response/rebuttal and any supplemental material will be provided to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development to be included into the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee via Box by the second Monday of September.

Upon dean and Executive Committee written decision/notification to the department chair noted in the 'Review by the Executive Committee' section, a meeting will be arranged by the department chair with the faculty member to discuss reappointment or non-reappointment for another probationary period, progress to date, appropriateness of workload and support available from the department based on the Executive Committee decision/notification. Before the meeting, the department chair will provide a copy of the Executive Committee's written decision to the candidate for review. The department chair will confirm with the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development in writing that the meeting between the faculty member and department chair has taken place. A copy of the review committee and Executive Committee review letters will remain on file and made available to the Executive Committee at promotion review.

Review by the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee will review all the faculty member's materials and evaluate the recommendations of the review committee including the department chair to make a recommendation of renewal or non-renewal of appointment to the dean. In the course of its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the internal review committee members (including the senior internal

reviewer and/or the department chair) to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. The Executive Committee will finalize their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean by the end of December. The department chair will be notified in writing of the dean and Executive Committee decision at that time.

Note: The final School of Nursing decision on each recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absence of all other parties.

Mock Review

Mock reviews are offered to all associate professors with tenure by the Executive Committee. A mock review is available at any time other than the year of application for promotion to professor with tenure but is encouraged in the third year after appointment or promotion to associate professor with tenure. The mock review is intended to facilitate the most optimal presentation of a faculty member for promotion to professor. The mock review is voluntary and is advisory in nature. To encourage these reviews, only a full curriculum vitae and publications since appointment to rank are required. A self-evaluation of teaching, research, and service accomplishments may also be submitted. No copies of the written summary by the Executive Committee will be placed in the School's files.

Promotion Review for Tenure Track Faculty

Important information regarding the University of Michigan's requirements and procedures for promotions can be found on the provost's website at:

http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/

and should be carefully reviewed in addition to the School of Nursing information presented below.

In making their recommendation for promotion, the responsible departments and colleges will study the whole record of each candidate. To warrant recommendation for promotion, candidates must have shown superior ability in at least one phase of their activities and substantial contribution in other phases. Naturally, persons who make a distinguished contribution in all aspects of their work may expect more rapid promotion than persons of more limited achievement. – *Promotion Guidelines, Attachment A, Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan*

Application of Promotion Criteria

These are guidelines that candidates and evaluating committees should consider *prior to submission* of the promotion casebook and indicate what superior ability looks like in each category. Substantial contribution is expected in each phase of activities (teaching, scholarship, and service) and candidates must show superior ability in at least one phase. *The indicators listed under each criterion are not meant to be considered as a checklist, but rather are designed to clarify existing criteria of the School of Nursing.* It is important to note that quality as well as the quantity of contributions will be evaluated.

Promotion to Professor

1. (Criteria) A sustained record of excellence in teaching, including experience with advanced students. Examples include:
 - a. Pattern of sustained excellence in formal teaching across all levels (undergraduate, graduate) since last promotion documented by:
 - i. University of Michigan Office of Evaluations and Examinations Teaching Questionnaire ratings (with explanation of any less than satisfactory ratings)
 - ii. Master teacher through peer evaluation
 - iii. Student educational and professional accomplishments that serve as indicators of teaching effectiveness (e.g., awards, NRSA traineeships, poster presentations)
 - b. Chair dissertation work to completion of two (2) or more doctoral students; also served on additional dissertation committees
 - c. Chair two (2) or more preliminary examination committees; also served on additional preliminary committees
 - d. Sustained record of multiple, completed master's and DNP students' projects
 - e. Evidence of sustained involvement in student advisement, informal teaching, mentoring and precepting of students at all levels (e.g., Honors, UROP, diversity and summer programs, research preceptorship, Hillman Scholar, and research experience, including pre-doctoral students and post-doctoral fellows; may include entrepreneurial and public service activities)
 - f. Documentation of contributions and innovations to curriculum (e.g., development of training grants, courses, seminars, lectures, teaching aides, new instructional methods, service-learning opportunities, computer-aided instruction, digital/remote instruction, interdisciplinary and interprofessional courses or lectures)
2. (Criteria) A sustained and growing record of scholarly eminence which advances the frontier of knowledge and demonstrates the impact of the work on the field. Examples include:
 - a. Recognized active program of research

- i. Actively contributes to a recognized, sustained, and impactful program of research, and/or
 - ii. Values single investigator and team science as evidenced by the engagement in collaboration and leadership of high impact research teams
 - b. Research support
 - i. Evidence of obtaining competitive external research funding as principal investigator or equivalent since the last promotion to support a program of research; may include industrial, non-profit, or other non-federal or foundation sources
 - ii. Evidence of high impact submission(s) for major funding with reviewers scores reflective of scientific merit and competitiveness
 - c. Publications
 - i. Participation in national guidelines and/or setting of standards (clinical and/or education)
 - ii. A substantial mix of first- or senior-authored and co-authored, peer reviewed, research-based, interdisciplinary and interprofessional, and/or clinical publications; evidence of three or more per year on average
 - iii. Evidence of citation by scholars (e.g., citation analyses through *Web of Science*)
 - iv. Scholarly work such as, books or chapters, published abstracts, software development, working to patent or license an invention, invited author or editor
- 3. (Criteria) A reputation among the candidate's colleagues and peers throughout the nation and preferably internationally for outstanding and continuing achievements in their field of expertise. Examples include:
 - a. Invited keynote or plenary presentations at national or international conferences
 - b. Recognition by peers (e.g., Fellow in the AAN or equivalent organization)
 - c. Training grants
 - d. Center grants
- 4. (Criteria) A reputation, supported by documented external evaluation, which recognizes the presence of leadership and the quality of the research activities, publications, and contributions to the profession in comparison with other professors. Examples include:
 - a. Five arm's length letters that taken together on balance indicate support for promotion from faculty members of full professor rank at research extensive universities.
- 5. (Criteria) A continuing record of recognized accomplishments in academic, professional and community service. Examples include:
 - a. Academic
 - i. School committees'/task forces (membership/leadership)
 - ii. University committees (membership)

- iii. Clinical practice
 - iv. Consultation
- b. Professional
 - i. Member of editorial board
 - ii. Professional organization (officer, chair, member)
 - iii. Clinical practice
 - iv. Consultation
 - v. Workshop (leader/development)
- c. Community service
 - i. Advisory/policy board (state, national, international)
 - ii. Consultation
 - iii. Workshop (leader/development)

Promotion to Associate Professor

1. (Criteria) A record of excellence in teaching. Example criteria:
 - a. Pattern of excellence in formal teaching at undergraduate and graduate levels documented by:
 - i. University of Michigan Office of Evaluations and Examinations Teaching Questionnaire ratings (with explanation of any less than satisfactory ratings)
 - ii. Master teacher through peer evaluation
 - iii. Student educational and professional accomplishments that serve as indicators of teaching effectiveness (e.g., awards, poster presentations)
 - b. Member of program planning, preliminary examination, and dissertation committees
 - c. A sustained record of completed master's and DNP students' projects with significant number as advisor
 - d. Evidence of sustained involvement in student advisement, informal teaching, mentoring, and precepting of students at all levels (e.g., Honors, UROP, diversity and summer programs, research preceptorship, and pre-doctoral research experience; may include entrepreneurial and public service activities)
 - e. Documentation of contributions and innovations to curriculum (e.g., development of courses, seminars, lectures, guest lectures, new teaching aides, new instructional methods, service-learning opportunities, computer-aided instruction, digital/remote instruction, interdisciplinary and interprofessional courses or lectures)
2. (Criteria) A distinguished record of scholarly attainment in the realm of scientific investigation, publication, and utilization of research findings in teaching, research, and service. Examples include:
 - a. Developing focused, leading-edge program of research in an area of high significance to the field

- i. Values single investigator and team science as evidenced by the engagement in collaboration and leadership of high impact research teams
 - b. Research support
 - i. Evidence of a developing track record of external funding for highly competitive research grants as principal investigator or equivalent since last appointment; may include industrial, non-profit, or other non-federal or foundation sources
 - ii. Evidence that applicant has obtained or submitted for major funding with reviewers' comments indicating scientific merit and competitiveness
 - c. Publications
 - i. A substantial mix of first- and co-authored, peer reviewed, research-based, interdisciplinary and interprofessional, and/or clinical-based publications; evidence of three or more per year on average
 - ii. Evidence of citation by other scholars (e.g., citation analyses through *Web of Science*)
 - iii. Scholarly work such as books or chapters, software development, working to patent or license an invention, invited author or editor
- 3. (Criteria) A reputation among colleagues for outstanding achievements and recognized contributions in their field of expertise. Examples include:
 - a. Regional and national refereed presentations
 - b. Five arm's length letters that taken together on balance indicate support for promotion from faculty members of at least Associate Professor rank at research extensive universities.
- 4. (Criteria) An admirable record of academic, professional and community service. Examples include:
 - a. Academic
 - i. School committees'/task forces (membership/leadership)
 - ii. University committees (membership)
 - iii. Clinical practice
 - iv. Consultation
 - b. Professional
 - i. Reviewer for refereed journal(s)
 - ii. Professional organization (section chair, member)
 - iii. Clinical practice
 - iv. Consultation
 - v. Workshop (leader/development)
 - c. Community service
 - i. Advisory/policy board (local, state, national)
 - ii. Consultation
 - iii. Workshop (leader/development)

Oversight of the Tenure and Promotion Process

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of promotion and/or tenure activities for all candidates across the departments in the School of Nursing. In fall (September/October) of each year, in conjunction with the Dean's Office, the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will publish the annual calendar for promotion and/or tenure dates. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development does not review the candidate's dossier nor make a recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure.

Initiation for the Review for Promotion

By February 1, faculty applicants will declare in writing their intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure in September of the following academic year to the chair of their department and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. The written intent will include whether the faculty applicant has a joint faculty appointment (with effort or dry (0%)) on the tenure track, clinical track and/or research tracks in another unit on campus and the relevant unit contact information of the faculty administrator (i.e., department chair, associate dean, director, etc.).

The candidate, the department chair and associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development reviews the request and, if agreement is reached, the applicant follows the procedures for compiling and submitting the necessary materials. In the event that the immediate supervisor does not approve the request, an explanation will be given in writing to the candidate. The faculty member is free to proceed with the application for promotion if the candidate is convinced of his/her readiness for promotion consideration.

Responsibility for facilitating the progress of faculty toward promotion rests with the department chair. The department chair is responsible for ensuring that fair and equitable evaluation of teaching, research, and service are conducted annually and communicated to the faculty member. The Executive Committee believes a mentoring process is most helpful for individuals as they progress in their careers. However, mentor-mentee relationships emerge voluntarily from situations of mutual benefit to both parties and such relationships cannot be mandated or assigned. The department chair is in a position to advise the faculty of mentorship opportunities, (e.g., names within the School of Nursing or on University of Michigan campus, professional development workshops, etc.) recognizing faculty may need multiple mentors (teaching, service, scholarship), and qualifications and procedures for promotion and review as well as to determine the candidate's readiness for promotion.

The recommendation for promotion developed by the review committee, including the department chair must address the candidate's readiness for

promotion and be applicable to the rank for which the applicant is to be considered.

Submitting a Dossier before Mandatory Review or Customary Promotion Review Cycle

The following policies pertain to faculty who submit a dossier for promotion and/or tenure during a review cycle prior to their mandatory review or customary promotion review timeline. The intent of this policy is transparency, fairness across tracks and fairness across individuals in review processes. This school policy and procedure is complementary to existing university and school policies and do not displace policies and procedures for mandatory review/timeline extensions.

Tenure track assistant professors and tenure track associate professors without tenure who are within their probationary period (without tenure) and who have successfully completed an end-of-term review and been reappointed may opt to submit their dossier for promotion and/or tenure during a review cycle prior to their mandatory review. A maximum of up to two reviews (one prior to the mandatory review and one at the time of the mandatory review) at the school-level for promotion and/or tenure may be allowed per candidate; however, only one university-level (Office of the Provost) review is allowed for promotion from assistant to associate professor with tenure or from associate professor without tenure to associate professor with tenure.

If after Executive Committee review, a positive/supportive recommendation is rendered, the faculty candidate dossier along with a positive/supportive recommendation will be advanced to the Provost Office for review. However, if after Executive Committee review, a negative/non-supportive recommendation is rendered, a negative vote will be recorded in the Executive Committee meeting minutes. The dean may offer the faculty candidate the option to withdraw their dossier and to resubmit it at the time of their mandatory review. If offered and accepted, the dossier will not be forward it to the Office of the Provost for university level review. However, if there is no offer for second review or if candidate refuses to withdraw their dossier (if offered), then the dossier along with a negative Executive Committee recommendation will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost for review. If after a Provost level review, a negative/non-supportive recommendation is rendered, the faculty candidate will be issued a terminal year.

Should the faculty dossier be withdrawn along with an offer to resubmit it, the next submission of the dossier for review will be at the time of mandatory review. If after the second Executive Committee School level (mandatory) review, the recommendation is negative/non-supportive, the dossier along with a negative recommendation by the Executive Committee will be forwarded to the Office of the Provost for review. If after an Office of the Provost level review, a

negative/non-supportive recommendation is rendered, the faculty candidate will be issued a terminal year.

Faculty applicants who hold appointments without tenure and who declare their intent to apply for tenure review in an earlier promotion cycle (a promotion cycle before their mandatory scheduled review) can withdraw their intent to apply for tenure between February 1 and 12 p.m. the last Thursday of March. The withdraw of intent to apply for early tenure review can be done once, unless exception approval from the department chair, dean and Executive Committee is obtained and the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development is consulted.

Questions regarding the process, should be directed to the department chair and/or the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development.

Documents to be Submitted by Candidate for Review

All candidate documents noted below are to be submitted in Word format except publications and teaching evaluations.

The applicant should submit documentation and evidence of strengths in teaching, research, and community service, selecting the areas applicable for the rank for which the candidate is applying. All documents must be in portrait format with the exception of course evaluation forms (E & E forms). Excel spreadsheets are not permissible as part of dossier materials.

1. Up-to-date curriculum vitae – with indication of the last time it was updated.
2. List of names of external reviewers – The candidate will submit no more than three (3) names of arm's length external reviewers* who may be willing to provide recommendations upon inquiry to the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development and the department chair. It is possible that an additional two (2) arm's length external reviewer names will be requested from the candidate but should not be supplied unless requested. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):
 - a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
 - b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
 - c. Selection rationale

The candidate may also suggest up to two (2) names with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not be asked to provide letters of recommendation. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty

development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individuals.

The department chair, in conjunction with the candidate's advocate and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewer names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. External reviewers outside the U.S. will not be solicited. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will select individuals from the list provided by the candidate but reserves the right to ask other reviewers because of inability of the listed reviewers to complete the reviews or for other reasons. In such cases, the promotion applicant will be informed.

* All external reviewers must be "arm's length" and be at or above the rank of the appointment being considered and from schools of similar stature. Emeriti and adjunct faculty are not eligible to serve as external reviewers. Tenure track candidates can only have tenure track reviewers. The University of Michigan policy states that arm's length reviews should come from individuals outside the present institution of the candidate and from individuals who have not worked or trained with the candidate at other institutions. Close collaborators, present or former advisors/mentors/teachers/ supervisors, present colleagues, and close personal friends are not allowed. Co-authors and major research collaborators, or former colleagues are only allowed if it has been more than 10 years since they have worked with the candidate. Letters from persons who have served on a candidate's thesis or dissertation committee are not considered "arm's length." When both an outside reviewer and the candidate are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an "arm's length" reviewer if s/he and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort (the absence of a direct collaboration must be documented in these cases). The reviewers should be individuals in the relevant field who can critique a candidate's work and scholarly contributions and be able to provide a truly evaluative and unbiased assessment. The reviews of greatest value are from people who may be unknown to the candidate but have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate's qualifications.

3. Publications - Five (5) pieces of the candidate's best work/publications (usually peer-reviewed papers) are included, with emphasis on the most recent or most representative since appointed or promoted to current professorial rank within the University of Michigan School of Nursing. The candidate provides notes on each of the five (5) papers. This is a single page per paper that explains why the candidate selected the paper, any unique or seminal contribution of the paper to nursing science, the impact factor, journal significance and in the case of multiple-authored papers, provides an explanation of the candidate's contribution. The citation survey may be used to demonstrate impact of some or all of the papers.
4. Self-evaluation - A narrative summarizing evidence that the candidate meets the criteria for the rank sought. To include the candidate's:
 - a. Teaching statement (including contributions to interdisciplinary and interprofessional teaching, if relevant),
 - b. Research statement (including a statement of impact of the candidate's research/scholarly work to be the first short paragraph of the statement; and contributions to interdisciplinary and interprofessional research, if relevant), and
 - c. Service statementThe narrative statement should not exceed five (5) pages. It should be single-spaced, in Word format, with 1-inch margins, 11-point font size in Times New Roman font. A limit of five (5) or fewer pages of additional tables and figures may be used to summarize data.
5. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness:
 - a. Summary teaching table (use the Provost Office approved template) listing scores on key questions (Q1, Q2, Q4, Q199, Q217, Q 230, Q891, Q1631, Q1632, and Q1633) from the course evaluation forms (E & E forms).
 - b. Instructor with comments report (E & E forms) for each course taught.
 - c. Supervisory teaching list including doctoral, master's and undergraduate supervision and role for each.
 - d. Additional materials in line with the teaching portfolio recommended by the Provost Office are encouraged.
6. Other materials may be requested by the review committee and/or Executive Committee.

Process for Review

Submission Requirements:

All faculty will abide by and comply with all submission deadlines. Missed deadlines will halt the process and will jeopardize the candidate's status in the School of Nursing. Only in extreme extenuating circumstances, extensions may be considered upon request to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development from the candidate.

Prior to the submission deadline of materials, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will send out three (3) email reminders to the candidate, copying the department chair:

- The first reminder will be sent two (2) weeks prior to the submission deadline;
- The second reminder will be sent one (1) week prior to the submission deadline; and
- The third reminder will be sent the day prior to the submission deadline.

All required materials are due by the submission deadline. Required materials not submitted by the deadline will halt the process and render the candidate ineligible for review during the current cycle.

Mandatory Promotion Review

Candidates undergoing a mandatory promotion and/or tenure review (e.g., assistant professor to associate professor with tenure, associate professor without tenure to associate professor with tenure) who fail to submit required review materials by the submission deadline will be provided a terminal year. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair via email that the review process has been halted and that the faculty member will receive a formal notice of non-reappointment letter under separate cover, and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office. A meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to discuss the notice of non- reappointment.

Non-Mandatory Promotion Review

Candidates undergoing a non-mandatory promotion review who fail to submit required review materials by the submission deadline will not be reviewed during the current review cycle in which they declared their intention. The candidate will have an opportunity to declare their intention to apply for promotion during the next review cycle. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair via email that the review process has been halted and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office.

Advocate Selection:

During the month of February, the candidate and the department chair select an advocate and then notify the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development of the faculty member selected by February 28. The advocate should be a senior faculty member at or above the rank being considered who knows the candidate and his/her scholarship and can work closely with the

candidate to assemble the necessary credentials.

Internal Review Committee Selection:

With input from the candidate and potentially the advocate, the department chair and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will identify at least two (2) senior faculty members at or above the rank being considered, preferably in the department and on the same track as the candidate within the School of Nursing and/or another school/college at the University of Michigan by 12 p.m. the last Thursday of March. The candidate may also suggest up to one (1) name with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not to be asked to serve as an internal reviewer. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individual.

The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Candidates will be informed of who their internal reviewers are. Together with the department chair, the two (2) senior faculty members will form the review committee. Each member of the review committee will independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review of the candidate's work using the School of Nursing's promotion and tenure criteria.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Note: Executive Committee members are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the Executive Committee.

List of External Reviewers:

By April 1, the candidate will submit the names of no more than three (3) arm's length external reviewers to their department chair. The department chair, in conjunction with the candidate's advocate and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewer names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development by April 1. External reviewers outside the U.S. will not be solicited. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended

External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development can add or remove names from the combined list and will approve the initial list by May 1.

When all candidates have declared their intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure and department chairs have submitted the combined list of external reviewers to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development, the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will receive the compiled lists and determine who should be contacted for external review letters and will send letters of request to the external reviewers in May or by early June.

The finalized list of external reviewers who will be contacted for agreement to review and write a recommendation letter, have agreed or not agreed to provide a recommendation, and the subsequent recommendations received by the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development will be held confidential for use only during the promotion review process; and no contact between the external reviewer and the candidate should take place.

All external review letters need to be received at the School of Nursing by the last Friday of August. External letters will be sent to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development to compile into the candidate's dossier. Once all external review letters have been received and the candidate's dossier is complete, it will be given to the review committee for their evaluation and recommendation.

Candidate's Dossier to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development:

The application for promotion and/or tenure and candidate's completed dossiers to be reviewed, should be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development via Box by no later than the last Thursday of May by 12 p.m. The candidate's access to the Box site will be removed after 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of May.

Timetable of Review

Careful and intensive review of all credentials of candidates by the School, including external recommendations, requires advanced planning and a timetable which will ensure that the recommendations for promotion are received by the

provost, president and the regents in advance of their scheduled meetings each year.

Review by the Internal Review Committee:

Review committee members, including the department chair will each conduct independent written reviews of the candidate's materials that includes completing the 'External Reviewer Summary of Comments Worksheet' as required by the Provost Office; will meet as a group to discuss their completed written reviews, and have the opportunity after the group meeting to revise their letter of recommendation before final submission of the letters to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development no later than by 12 p.m. on the second Thursday of October. The department chair will coordinate and arrange the meeting of the review committee to discuss their completed reviews including the external reviewer assessments and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise before the October deadline. The independent written reviews of the review committee and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature. All recommendation letters should reflect a candid review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that arose through the review process, include comments from all external reviewer recommendations, address any areas needing improvement and distill to a clear recommendation. All independent recommendation letters as well as the consolidated 'External Reviewer Summary Comments Worksheet' will be included in the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee. Candidates will not be informed of the recommendations from the review committee or department chair to the dean and Executive Committee.

It should be noted that candidates have the ability to submit new and relevant information (such as funded grants, accepted publications, etc.) at any time in the process.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Review by the Dean and Executive Committee:

The dean and the Executive Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of all candidate dossiers and the independent recommendations of the review committee members including the department chair and the consolidated 'External Reviewer Summary of Comments Worksheet' in November. During its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the review committee members including the department chair to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. The dean and Executive Committee will then draft a preliminary recommendation to the candidate by December that includes gaps as well as requests for clarification and/or additional

information. Candidates have until January 1 to respond to the preliminary recommendation and provide the required clarifications and/or additional information. During this time, the dean and the Executive Committee may also return a recommendation to a review committee member with specific instructions for further review.

The Executive Committee will finalize their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean by February 1. At that time, candidates will be informed in writing only of the recommendation going forward and a meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to go over the outcome of the review. The candidate has an opportunity to submit supplemental material prior to their file going to the Provost's Office. The final School of Nursing decision on each recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absence of all other parties.

The HR Office and the Dean's Office will work together to ensure that all required elements are submitted to the Provost's Office by the deadline.
Review by University Officials:

As with appointments, all recommendations of the dean and the Executive Committee concerning re-appointment, promotion, and tenure, in order to be implemented as recommended, require the approval of the appropriate university officials.

Recommendation to the Provost by February 1:

The provost forwards all recommendations for tenure and promotion to the associate professor and professor ranks to the Regents for final action on recommendations for promotions and tenure.
Notification of Final Decision:

Notification of candidate - The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the recommendation of the Executive Committee. At a later date, the dean will notify the candidate and her/his chair of the recommendations of the provost and, if applicable, of the final decision of the Board of Regents. The candidate may request clarification of these decisions in conference with the dean or the Executive Committee.

TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT, DENIAL OF PROMOTION AND TENURE, THE APPEAL PROCESS, AND ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

Preface

The establishment of a probationary period and a commitment to make a decision regarding reappointment and/or promotion in advance of the end of the probationary period, as well as the implementation of an annual review and evaluation are efforts to:

1) create a fair system with effective appointment, promotion and tenure policies and practices, and 2) promote the recognition of the achievement of all who meet the criteria and standards for promotion and tenure.

Termination or Notice of Non-reappointment

Tenure track faculty without tenure and clinical track instructional faculty with less than one (1) year of continuous service will be given notice of non-reappointment at least three months before the scheduled expiration of that appointment. Faculty members with more than one (1) year, but less than two (2) years, of continuous service should be given notice of non-reappointment by December 15 if the appointment expires at the end of the winter term or if the appointment expires on a date other than at the end of winter term. Faculty members whose years of continuous service have extended beyond two (2) years should be given notice of non-reappointment by September 15 if the appointment expires at the end of winter term or no later than the date, that would provide nine months' advance notice.

SPG 201.88, 'Notice of Non-reappointment' - <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.88>

Academic Appointments: Pay Schedules – Resignation/Termination – Benefits

Pay Schedules:

Faculty members typically hold either University-year (Academic-year, nine-month) or twelve-month appointments. University-year appointees begin on the last Monday of August or January 1 and receive their salary payments allocated on a fiscal year basis (July 1 – June 30) for a nine-month (last Monday of August – May 31) appointment on the last working day of the month. For new University-year appointees who begin on the last Monday of August, three payments (pre-payments for July/August and regular payment for September) will be received in the end of September payment. Twelve-month appointees can begin on any date of the month, and receive 12 monthly salary payments, payable on the last working day of the month.

U-M Faculty Handbook, 14.C Salary Payments –
<http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/14/14.C.html>

Resignation/Termination:

Resignation of a faculty member within the term of appointment requires proper notice. Resigning faculty are expected to provide adequate formal written notice (prior to April 1 for the following academic year) of their intent to resign to their department chair. This notice needs to be done prior to the effective date of resignation and preferably a full term (four months) in advance in order to avoid possible overpayments and discontinuance of benefits eligibility.

For University-year appointees, the last day of work upon resignation must be either December 31 or May 31. For December 31 resignations the last paycheck will be issued at the end of December and benefits will terminate on December 31. For May 31 resignations the last paycheck will be issued at the end of June and benefits terminate on May 31. For University-year appointees, if resignation comes at another point beyond April 1 there may be consequences related to pay and/or benefits depending on the selected appointment end date, including the faculty member being responsible for repaying the 'pre-payments' for July and/or August, and/or regular payments received for the following academic year. For twelve-month appointees, the last day of work upon resignation must be the last day of the month. For twelve-month appointments, if the faculty member resigns at another point in the academic year, a proration of salary payment will take place. Therefore, prior to April 1 notice is preferred.

Faculty members are asked to contact their department chair, and/or the HR Office with questions.

SPG 201.40, 'Termination of Employment' - <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.40>

Academic Appointments Manual, 'Termination and Non-Reappointment' - <http://hr.umich.edu/acadhr/personnelmanual/changes/termination.html>

Employment Benefits:

For a new hire and/or newly eligible faculty member benefits eligibility begins on the first day of appointment. Specific benefits options will be shown on Employee Self-Service > Benefits on Wolverine Access (<https://wolverineaccess.umich.edu>) after the faculty member's appointment is processed and on the employment system. A faculty member will receive a notification email to go into Employee Self-Service to make benefits selections online. Generally, faculty members have 30 days from their service date or the date they become newly eligible to make benefits elections. Once benefits elections are made online they remain until the next open enrollment period (normally in October each year), with changes effective January 1. Once a faculty member makes his/her benefits elections and they are confirmed online, a faculty member may not make any changes (even within the 30-day enrollment period) unless there is a qualifying family status change.

The University of Michigan and/or the School of Nursing is not responsible for benefits after the date of termination. Faculty who may have a gap in their benefits coverage should consider COBRA coverage or contact their new institution regarding benefits enrollment.

For questions related to benefits go to the U-M Benefits Office website - <https://hr.umich.edu/benefits-wellness>.

Provisions of Regents Bylaw 5.09

Regents Bylaw 5.09 permits the acquisition of defacto tenure with the right to a proceeding involving hearings and review, for a teaching faculty member holding appointments with the university for a total of ten years in the rank of full-time instructor or higher with no regental action. Policies within the School of Nursing clearly prevent instructional faculty members from obtaining inadvertent defacto tenure. Each non-tenured regular instructional faculty member must be reviewed for tenure no later than by the end of the seventh year of full-time service at the University of Michigan. If tenure has not been obtained by the regular instructional faculty member before the end of the seventh year of full-time academic service at the University of Michigan, the dean of the School of Nursing will notify the individual in writing within the first three weeks of the sixth year, that unless tenure is granted by the end of the seventh year of full-time academic service at the University of Michigan, a terminal appointment will be given for the eighth year. The extension of an appointment as professor or associate professor explicitly without tenure beyond the tenth year is strongly discouraged and these individuals are ineligible for the appeals proceedings of section 5.09 of the Regents Bylaws.

Denial of Promotion and Tenure and the Appeal Process

An applicant for reappointment, promotion or tenure who is not satisfied, on procedural grounds, with the decision of the dean and the Executive Committee may initiate a formal appeal of the promotion review. The appeal procedure follows the established lines of administrative organization within the School of Nursing and the University of Michigan. The School of Nursing grievance procedures are presented in Appendix A.

CLINICAL TRACK FACULTY

Clinical Track faculty will be persons distinguished by their excellence in clinically relevant practice, scholarship, teaching and mentoring of students. This includes application of advanced nursing knowledge and skills in a defined area of expertise that align with the mission of the school. The school's instructional resources can be strengthened and diversified with clinical track faculty members who possess current, high-quality, clinical skills.

It is essential for clinical track faculty to maintain their expertise in nursing practice. Maintaining a funded clinical practice is a requirement of all clinical track faculty and provides clinical faculty with the ability to gain knowledge, demonstrate expertise, and maintain skill in the clinical arena through the provision of care, directly or indirectly. This requirement enhances the students' learning environment, the faculty's teaching and scholarship, and fosters high quality clinical nurse educators who practice in diverse settings which adds value to the school, University, and students' education and experience in conjunction with promoting improved health outcomes at the individual, community or health system level.

DEFINITION OF CLINICAL PRACTICE

Clinical practice is defined as clinically focused nursing activities that facilitate synergy among practice, education, scholarship, and research, while supporting valuable clinical partnerships with other providers, health systems and communities. Clinical practice must provide enrichment of clinical track faculty and student knowledge, skills, and clinical expertise in addition to meeting the mission, vision, and values of the school, while considering the specific requirements needed for each faculty to maintain licensure and certification (when applicable).

FACULTY PRACTICE

Expectations and Requirements

All full-time clinical track faculty must maintain a funded clinical practice role; maintain an unencumbered license to practice; and maintain practice privileges in good standing at a designated practice agency as necessary; and must be in compliance with all orientations, licenses/certifications, policies and procedures both internal and external to the University for assigned classroom(s) and/or clinical site(s).

The standard for clinical practice for clinical track faculty is to maintain a minimum of a 20% clinical practice FTE, annualized, to maintain competence in the clinical role. Clinical appointment fractions will be monitored and reported out annually as part of the standard annual review and faculty activity plan processes. Maintenance of 20% clinical practice FTE is particularly important for those in direct patient clinical roles for maintenance of certification, institutional credentialing, and maintenance of currency of knowledge and skills specific to the patient care role. However, there are a variety of clinical practice roles that faculty may fulfill and occasionally there may be times when it is allowable or preferable for the annual FTE for clinical practice to fall below 20% (i.e. grant activity role, model of practice at system or community-level). If faculty practice falls below the 20% annualized standard clinical requirement, there will be a process for

review on a case-by-case basis for approval. To maintain the integrity of the clinical track and the faculty practice component and to have a faculty-led process for review of level of percent appointment, faculty in this situation will be directed to meet with the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies to put forth a proposal for the transitional clinical practice plan to be approved by the department chair and reviewed by the Faculty Practice Advisory Committee. A level of clinical practice below 10% will not be approved.

For clinical track faculty who have an initial appointment that is planned to be less than full-time, but more than .50 FTE, the practice role will be prorated by the level of appointment (e.g., .75 FTE will require .15 FTE practice role, .50 FTE will require a .10 FTE practice role). For any clinical track faculty appointment below .50 FTE, the practice requirement will be 10% clinical practice to assure a meaningful engagement in the practice environment.

If there is an instance when a clinical track faculty member is unable to meet the practice role requirement due to the loss or lack of a practice opportunity, the clinical track faculty member is responsible to participate in a process of identifying another practice opportunity to fulfill the requirements of a clinical track faculty member. Support during this process to identify and secure a practice opportunity is provided by the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies. Clinical Track faculty have the opportunity to identify a new practice site within a semester (or 4-month period) to replace the prior practice site. During longer intervals, beyond four months, if a practice role is not available a clinical track faculty member's teaching credit allocation may increase for a semester for a 9-month appointment or two semesters for a 12-month appointment or their salary could be reduced by the required practice appointment level (e.g., a full-time, 1.0 FTE with a 20% clinical practice requirement would result in a .80 FTE salary).

If a practice opportunity is not identified within an academic year (nine months or 12 months dependent on appointment period) a reappointment on the clinical track or continuation in a multi-year appointment may not be possible if the clinical track faculty member cannot meet the required practice role for the position. For clinical track faculty who cannot identify a practice opportunity or who prefer to not be in active practice their clinical track faculty appointment would end with the possibility of different employment that does not require a practice role. Discussion of possible options would occur with the clinical track faculty member's department chair and/or the associate dean for undergraduate studies as appropriate.

Faculty Practice Options

Models of faculty practice are flexible and include the following options for clinical track faculty to actualize the required practice component of their clinical track faculty role:

Option 1: Bring your own practice

Clinical track faculty who have a current practice opportunity may be able to use that site and practice model as their clinical practice. If a clinical track faculty member brings their own practice to meet the minimum required 20%* clinical practice FTE for a full-time appointment, they will complete the following steps:

- Meet with the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies to outline their planned practice model. The clinical track faculty member will be provided with the necessary form to document the practice effort, location, and point-of-contact for the practice.
- In this model, the school will provide salary support for up to .80 FTE for the faculty clinical track member and the remaining 20% of the clinical track faculty member's salary will be derived from their external practice and separate practice site employer and paid directly to the faculty member.
- Clinical track faculty using this model will have the same rights and privileges for faculty voting as a full-time faculty member if their combined FTE between their external practice role and their School of Nursing appointment is equal 1.0 FTE (or whatever the combined FTE equals if less than a full-time combined appointment).
- Clinical track faculty who desire this model can consult with the HR Office to assist in determining the impact of this option on their benefits eligibility.
- Clinical track faculty using this appointment option will have their external employer complete an attestation of the practice appointment and an annual evaluation of their practice role.

Option 2: Participate in a school assigned practice option

The school maintains a number of practice opportunities through partnerships with other health care providers, community partners and health systems. Clinical Track faculty members may choose to be assigned to a one of these partnerships for a minimum of the required 20%* clinical practice FTE for a full-time clinical track faculty appointment. If there is a desire for this type of appointment, the clinical track faculty member will complete the following steps:

- Meet with the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies to review potential practice opportunities that are available. The focus will be on identifying a match between the clinical track faculty member's expertise, scholarship, and certification (if applicable) and the available practice model opportunities.

- When there is a match between the clinical track faculty member's expertise for the practice opportunities and the practice partner's needs, the clinical track faculty member will then meet with the practice site representative to confirm the alignment between the clinical track faculty member's expertise and clinical practice site needs and options.
- Appointments to this model are generally expected to be for a full academic year (either nine months or 12 months) beginning each Fall term.
- In this model, the school will provide salary support for up to .80 FTE of the faculty role and the practice partner will provide the school with the practice component funding for the minimum of 20%* FTE. The clinical track faculty appointment will be full-time, 1.0 FTE within the school (or whatever the combined FTE equals if less than a full-time combined appointment).

Option 3: Participate or be hired for a school clinical practice initiative (mission driven):

A clinical track faculty member may have opportunities to participate in or lead grant funded scholarship, research, or consultancy that engages their practice expertise. Faculty members may choose to meet their clinical track practice requirement for the minimum of 20%* by participating in grant funded scholarship or research. If there is a desire for this type of clinical track faculty appointment, the faculty member will complete the following steps:

- Meet with the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies and identify a practice opportunity that is available and the funding stream that is available for the role. In some instances, the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies may have opportunities available that can be shared with clinical track faculty. In this instance the focus will be on identifying a match between the clinical track faculty member's expertise, scholarship, and certification (if applicable) and the available scholarship or research opportunities.
- Appointments to this model are generally expected to be for a full academic year (either nine months or 12 months) beginning each Fall term but exceptions for grant cycles outside of this model may be considered.
- In this model, the school will provide salary support for up to .80 FTE of the faculty role and the grant/consultancy will provide the funding for the practice component funding for the minimum of 20%* FTE. The clinical track faculty appointment will be full-time, 1.0 FTE within the school (or whatever the combined FTE equals if less than a full-time combined appointment).

*Options for less than 20% clinical practice FTE but not lower than 10% clinical practice FTE are possible. This option requires a meeting with the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies followed by approval by Faculty Practice Advisory Committee and its chair. If approved, the clinical track faculty member increases their teaching credit by 10% or 2 credits.

Clinical Track faculty may choose the type of clinical practice that best suits their professional needs from the above list of available options. Clinical Track faculty will choose an option at the time of their initial appointment to the clinical track and will review this selection yearly during the faculty annual review process. If there are proposed changes to the practice model or site, the clinical track faculty member will review the proposed change (including level of appointment) with their department chair and/or the associate dean for undergraduate studies and the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies to assure the new practice appointment or site is mutually beneficial for the clinical track faculty member, the school, and fulfills the practice role requirement. Changes in faculty practice options generally occur during the reappointment process or annually at the beginning of the new academic year.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE CLINICAL TRACK

Appointments shall be highly selective using rigorous standards. Individuals appointed to clinical assistant professor will have demonstrated clinical teaching ability, practice excellence, and clinically relevant scholarship. Individuals appointed/promoted to associate and higher ranks will have clearly demonstrated records of accomplishment and will have gained the respect of their clinical peers and the academic nursing community.

Important information regarding the University of Michigan's requirements and procedures for appointments can be found on the provost's website at:

http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/appointment_guidelines/

and should be carefully reviewed in addition to the School of Nursing information presented below.

In making their recommendation for appointment, the responsible departments and colleges will study the whole record of each candidate. To warrant recommendation for initial appointment, candidates must have given evidence either here or elsewhere of their ability to handle satisfactorily the duties of the positions in question. – *Promotion Guidelines, Attachment A, Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan*

Clinical Professor

The title of clinical professor is accorded the individual who has met the requirements for appointment as a clinical associate professor, has a minimum of three years teaching experience as a clinical associate professor, and who has established:

1. A sustained record of excellence in clinically relevant teaching, including experience with advanced students;
2. Evidence of national and preferably international clinically relevant leadership and practice excellence;
3. Evidence of sustained national and preferably international clinical scholarship;
4. Evidence of national leadership in service to the profession and academic community.

Initial appointment to the clinical faculty with the title of clinical professor is made for a period of up to three years. In the third year of initial appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided. Appointments are renewable with evidence of appropriate performance, funded clinical practice, available funding and need. Appointment to this rank requires the approval of the regents on recommendation of the dean, the Executive Committee, the provost, and the president. Qualifications include a doctorate in nursing (or related field) and appropriate clinical credentials to practice.

Clinical Associate Professor

The title of clinical associate professor is accorded the individual who has met the requirements for appointment as a clinical assistant professor and who has established:

1. Evidence of excellence in clinically relevant teaching;
2. Evidence of effective clinically relevant program development;
3. Sustained clinically relevant scholarship;
4. Evidence of substantial service to the profession and academic community.

Initial appointment to the clinical faculty with the title of clinical associate professor is made for a period of up to three years. In the third year of initial appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided. Appointment to this rank requires the approval of the regents on recommendation of the dean, the Executive Committee, the provost, and the president. Continued appointment after successful end-of-term review as clinical associate professor is based on evidence of appropriate performance, funded clinical practice, available funding and need. Progression on the clinical track is strongly encouraged, but not mandatory. Qualifications include a doctorate in nursing (or related field) and appropriate clinical credentials to practice.

Clinical Assistant Professor

The title of clinical assistant professor is accorded the individual who has met the requirements for appointment as a clinical instructor and who has established:

1. Demonstrated clinical teaching ability and practice excellence in a defined relevant area of clinical expertise;
2. Current clinical experience in a practice relevant role;
3. Evidence of clinically relevant scholarship;
4. Evidence of increasing service to the profession and academic community.

Initial appointment to the clinical faculty with the title of clinical assistant professor is made for a period of up to three years. In the third year of initial appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided. Continued appointment after successful end-of-term review as clinical assistant professor is based on evidence of appropriate performance, funded clinical practice, available funding and need. Progression on the clinical track is strongly encouraged, but not mandatory. A clinical assistant professor who has successfully completed end-of-term review and is reviewed for promotion but is not successfully promoted to clinical associate professor will remain in rank to complete their current contract. Future contracts are based on mutual agreement. Repeated attempts at promotion review are allowed. Appointment to this rank is made on recommendation of the dean and Executive Committee. Qualifications include a doctorate in nursing (or related field) and appropriate clinical credentials to practice.

Clinical Instructor

The title of clinical instructor is accorded the individual who has established:

1. Potential as a teacher, role model, and clinical scholar. Possible indicators include:
 - a. Designs and implements classes and clinical experiences within existing course and curricular guidelines;
 - b. Guest lectures;
 - c. Contributes to teaching mission at department and program level;
 - d. Completes delegated teaching responsibilities competently;
 - e. Enhances teaching with relevant experiences from own clinical practice;
 - f. Integrates students into own clinical practice and serves as a mentor for students in clinical practice;
 - g. Modifies teaching plans based on student/peer feedback and self-reflection;
 - h. Serves as reader on master's students' scholarly projects.
2. Current clinical experience in an advanced practice role. Possible indicators include:

- a. Functions in an advanced practice role with an identified area of expertise and/or patient population;
 - b. Contributes to the advancement of nursing practice excellence through improving key quality indicators for his/her identified patient population or area of expertise;
 - c. Promotes practice excellence of staff nurses or other health care providers in the identified area of expertise;
 - d. Provides and evaluates care according to national evidence-based practice standards;
 - e. Membership/affiliation with appropriate professional/clinical organizations;
 - f. Mentors students in practice site;
 - g. Actively participates in peer review of practice.
3. Evidence of potential for clinical scholarship. Possible indicators include:
- a. Has identified cases or concepts of interest;
 - b. Raises clinical questions having the potential for scholarly inquiry;
 - c. Writes editorials, letters to the editor, clinically relevant papers;
 - d. Contributes expertise to work of research/evaluation teams' activities;
 - e. Critiques research for its clinical relevance;
 - f. Presentations at clinical conferences; author/co-author on clinically relevant manuscripts.
4. Evidence of service in practice and professional organizations. Possible indicators include:
- a. Contributes clinical expertise to community organizations;
 - b. Serves on practice related committees and in professional and/or practice setting.

Appointment to the clinical faculty with the title of clinical instructor is made for one (1) year and is renewable with demonstrated ability as a quality teacher, sufficient productivity as a clinical scholar, evidence of appropriate performance, funded clinical practice, available funding and need. There is no limit to the number of re-appointments that may be made at the rank of clinical instructor. The title of clinical instructor is not a promotable rank/position. Qualifications include a master's degree in nursing (or related field).

PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS

Oversight of the Initial Appointment Process

The chair of the department is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates at the rank of clinical instructor or clinical assistant professor for their department. The associate dean for undergraduate studies is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates at the rank of clinical instructor for the Undergraduate Program. The department chair, associate dean and/or search committee chair is directly responsible for contacting a minimum of three (3)

professional references provided by the candidate before salary negotiations and/or a contingent offer is provided.

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates at the rank of clinical associate professor or clinical professor across the departments in conjunction with the chair of the department. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development does not review the candidate's materials nor does s/he make a recommendation regarding appointment. The department chair, associate dean and/or search committee chair is directly responsible for contacting a minimum of three (3) professional references provided by the candidate before salary negotiations and/or a contingent offer is provided.

The Office of the Provost faculty appointment guidelines detail procedures for obtaining approval to extend an offer for appointment to the rank of clinical associate professor or clinical professor. These detailed materials must be submitted to the Office of the Provost prior to extending an offer. Following review by the Provost and the President, the Office of the Provost will inform the dean of the decision.

Process

The chair of the department or the associate dean for undergraduate studies who is primarily responsible recommends candidates for a specific rank and term of appointment to the dean, and forwards their credentials to the HR Office for the ranks of clinical instructor or clinical assistant professor or the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development for the ranks of clinical associate professor or clinical professor. The final determination of a specific rank and term of appointment will be made at the discretion of the dean based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee. See below for more information.

Clinical Instructor

Appointment to the rank of clinical instructor is based on demonstrated merit and specific skills and abilities, which are commensurate with the needs of the school. For appointments at the rank of clinical instructor the department chair or the associate dean for undergraduate studies who is primarily responsible recommends candidates for a specific term of appointment to the dean and forwards their credentials to the HR Office after an available position has been formally established on the track, and an official and open search process to fill the position has been completed, which includes a successful scholarly presentation.

The appointment portfolio will be prepared by the candidate with input from the department chair or the associate dean for undergraduate studies. The portfolio will include all elements as outlined in the guidelines below for appointment. The department chair or the associate dean for undergraduate studies will conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review regarding the quality and productivity of the candidate justifying the

appointment at the specified rank using the school's appointment criteria. The department chair or the associate dean for undergraduate studies will prepare a recommendation letter to the dean and Executive Committee and submit it to the HR Office for inclusion in the candidate's dossier. At that time, the final dossier will go to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will conduct their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean.

Clinical Assistant Professor

Appointment to the rank of clinical assistant professor is based on demonstrated merit and specific skills and abilities, which are commensurate with the needs of the school. Each year, at the end of Winter term the Dean's Office will notify department chairs and the associate dean for undergraduate studies and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development who will notify internal clinical instructors and external applicants that there are open/budgeted positions within each department (if any) to apply for. Appointment to the rank of clinical assistant professor will be treated as a new appointment for both internal and external applicants and will be handled as a regular search meaning there can be competition for the open positions by outside candidates.

For appointments at the rank of clinical assistant professor the department chair who is primarily responsible recommends candidates for a specific term of appointment to the dean and forwards their credentials to the HR Office for clinical assistant professor after an available position has been formally established on the track, and an official and open search process to fill the position has been completed, which includes a successful scholarly presentation. For internal applicants at the rank of clinical instructor in the Undergraduate Program, under the leadership of the associate dean for undergraduate studies, a recommendation from the associate dean is required. The recommendation would include best fit within a department as well as acknowledgement that this would be a joint appointment between the program and the recommended department.

The appointment portfolio will be prepared by the candidate with input from the department chair. The portfolio will include all elements as outlined in the guidelines below for appointment. The department chair will conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review regarding the quality and productivity of the candidate justifying the appointment at the specified rank using the school's appointment criteria. The department chair will prepare a recommendation letter to the dean and Executive Committee and submit it to the HR Office for inclusion in the candidate's dossier. At that time, the final dossier will go to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will conduct their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean.

Clinical Associate Professor/Clinical Professor

Appointment to the rank of clinical associate professor or clinical professor is based on demonstrated merit and specific skills and abilities, which are commensurate with the needs of the school. If the recommended rank is clinical associate professor or clinical professor the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the

department chair will identify at least two (2) senior faculty members at or above the rank being considered who are preferably in the department and on the same track as the candidate. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Together with the department chair, the two (2) senior faculty members will form the review committee and will each independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review regarding the quality and productivity of the candidate justifying the appointment at the specified rank using the school's appointment criteria.

Note: Executive Committee members are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the Executive Committee.

A qualified applicant can be reviewed either as a new appointment or as a transfer from another faculty track. Further information about the processes is listed below.

New Appointments

The Executive Committee accepts materials to review a candidate for a new appointment to the clinical track when all of the following conditions are met:

1. Availability of a position has been formally established in the track;
2. An official and open search process to fill the position has been completed, if required;
3. A packet of review materials is forwarded by the appropriate department chair or associate dean for undergraduate studies;
4. Documentation of an approved and qualifying (i.e., with a minimum of 20% FTE funding) funded faculty practice and, if applicable, evidence of appropriate credentialing is provided by the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies in conjunction with the department chair and/or associate dean for undergraduate studies.

Special note: An individual holding a current faculty appointment in another faculty track may be declared as a candidate for a new clinical track appointment via the official search process.

Transfer Appointments

The Executive Committee accepts materials to review a candidate for a transfer to the clinical track when both of the following conditions are met:

1. A packet of review materials is forwarded by the appropriate department chair;

2. Documentation of an approved and qualifying (i.e., with a minimum of 20% FTE funding) faculty practice and, if applicable, evidence of appropriate credentialing is provided by the associate dean for practice and professional graduate studies in conjunction with the department chair and/or associate dean for undergraduate studies.

Documents and Credentials Required for Executive Committee Review

All candidate documents noted below are to be submitted in Word format except publications and teaching evaluations.

1. Letter of recommendation from department chair or associate dean for undergraduate studies (for clinical instructors, clinical assistant professors, clinical associate professors and clinical professors), to include:
 - a. Proposed rank, effective date, and term of appointment.
 - b. Substantive description of candidate's work and significant contributions to the field demonstrating that the candidate meets the criteria for the rank sought in regards to teaching, scholarship, and service.
 - c. Description of the appointment in the context of the field and the specific needs of the school.
 - d. Candidate's strengths in relation to the department or Undergraduate Program's instructional and/or clinical objectives and the role of the candidate in meeting the needs of the program.
 - e. Summary of the search committee's report and evaluations from faculty regarding the candidate's visit and presentation.
 - f. Summary of oral references contacted.
2. Letter of recommendation from internal review committee members (for clinical associate professors and clinical professors' candidates only)
3. Curriculum vitae of the candidate – with indication of the last time it was updated.
4. Evidence of a current nursing license(s) in a U.S. jurisdiction or for the state in which the candidate expects to practice.
5. Examples of scholarly products pertinent to the rank sought – Three (3) to five (5) copies of the candidate's best work/publications, with emphasis on the most recent or most representative, since last promotion or appointment.
6. Evidence of teaching experience and performance:
 - a. Teaching statement from the candidate.
 - b. Explanation of the teaching evaluation system (for clinical associate professors and clinical professors only) and where the candidate ranks quantitatively in the system. Summaries of evaluations involving ratings as well as student comments can be included; similarly, summaries should be provided for peer evaluations and clinical evaluations, if forms are used for these.
7. A scholarship statement from the candidate that includes a statement of impact of his/her scholarly work to be the first short paragraph
8. A service statement from candidate.

9. Provide a list of a minimum of three (3) professional references (all ranks) with relevant contact information.
10. Letters of recommendation (for clinical instructor and clinical assistant professor candidates only) - Three (3) letters of endorsement/evaluation, particularly from the agency in which the individual currently practices, attesting to the candidate's level of proficiency for teaching, practice, and scholarship. Recommenders should be at or above the rank of the candidate and include statements in regard to the following:
 - a. Teaching: A description and evaluation of the candidate's teaching experience, ability, and reasons for believing the candidate will continue to develop as an effective teacher and scholar.
 - b. Scholarship: A description and evaluation of the quality, originality and significance of the candidate's scholarship should be included, as well as a description of scholarship in progress. The statement should also include reasons for believing the candidate will continue to develop as an effective scholar.
 - c. Academic, professional, and community service: A description and evaluation of the candidate's contribution in areas other than teaching and scholarship. These areas may include administrative responsibilities, leadership positions and participation in professional associations and civic organizations. Professional competence in the field and experience should also be acknowledged.
11. List of names of external reviewers (for clinical associate professor and clinical professor candidates only) – The candidate can submit no more than three (3) names of arm's length external reviewers* who are willing to provide recommendations upon inquiry need to be furnished by the candidate. It is possible that an additional two (2) arm's length external reviewer names will be requested from the candidate but should not be supplied unless requested. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):
 - a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
 - b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
 - c. Selection rationale

The candidate may also suggest up to two (2) names with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not be asked to provide letters of recommendation. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individuals.

* All external reviewers must be "arm's length" and be at or above the rank of the appointment being considered and from schools of similar stature. Emeriti and adjunct faculty are not eligible to serve as external reviewers. Clinical track candidates can have tenure track or clinical reviewers. The University of Michigan policy states that arm's length reviews should come from individuals outside the present institution of the candidate and from individuals who have not

worked or trained with the candidate at other institutions. Close collaborators, present or former advisors/mentors/teachers/supervisors, present colleagues, and close personal friends are not allowed. Co-authors and major research collaborators, or former colleagues are only allowed if it has been more than 10 years since they have worked with the candidate. Letters from persons who have served on a candidate's thesis or dissertation committee are not considered "arm's length." When both an outside reviewer and the candidate are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an "arm's length" reviewer if s/he and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort (the absence of a direct collaboration must be documented in these cases). For clinical faculty only, it is allowable to have two (2) of the five "arm's length" letters from local sources. The two (2) letters from local sources can be from the candidate's current institution as long as the local sources are outside of the candidate's department and have seen the clinical work and actual teaching but are not mentors or scholarly collaborators. The reviewers should be individuals in the relevant field who can critique a candidate's work and scholarly contributions and be able to provide a truly evaluative and unbiased assessment. The reviews of greatest value are from people who may be unknown to the candidate but have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate's qualifications.

The candidate will submit names of no more than three (3) arm's length external reviewers to the department chair. The department chair, with possible input from the two (2) senior faculty members and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewers' names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development can add or remove names from the combined list and will approve the initial list, determine who should be contacted for external review letters and will send letters of request to the external reviewers. The finalized list of external reviewers who will be contacted for agreement to review and write a recommendation letter, have agreed or not agreed to provide a recommendation, and the subsequent recommendations received by the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development will be held confidential for use only during the appointment review process; and no contact between the external reviewer and the candidate should take place.

Review by the Internal Review Committee (for clinical associate professor or clinical professor only):

Once all external review letters have been received and the candidate's dossier is complete, it will be given to the review committee for their evaluation and recommendation. The review committee, including the department chair, will each conduct independent written reviews of the material. The department chair will coordinate and arrange a meeting of the review committee to discuss their completed reviews, including the external reviewer assessments, and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise. The written reviews of the review committee and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature. All recommendation letters should reflect a candid review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that arose through the review process, include comments from all external reviewer recommendations, address any areas needing improvement and distill to a clear recommendation. All independent recommendation letters will be included in the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee for review and vote.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Review by the Dean and Executive Committee (for clinical associate professors and clinical professor candidates only):

The dean and the Executive Committee shall conduct a review of the candidate dossier and the independent recommendations of the review committee members including the department chair. During its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the review committee members, including the department chair to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. During this time, the dean and the Executive Committee may also return a recommendation to a review committee member with specific instructions for further review. The dean and the Executive Committee will then finalize their review and vote on their recommendation. The final School of Nursing decision on the recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absences of all other parties. The HR Office and the Dean's Office will ensure that all required elements are submitted to the Provost's Office, if applicable.

Current Title	Requested Title	External Review
Lecturer I through IV	Clinical Instructor Clinical Assistant Professor*	No
Lecturer I through IV	Clinical Associate Professor* Clinical Professor*	Yes
Research Investigator or Assistant Research Scientist Assistant Research Professor	Clinical Assistant Professor*	No

Assistant Professor		
Research Investigator or Assistant Research Scientists Assistant Research Professor Assistant Professor	Clinical Associate Professor* Clinical Professor*	Yes
Associate Research Scientist Associate Research Professor Associate Professor	Clinical Associate Professor	Yes
Associate Research Scientist Associate Research Professor Associate Professor	Clinical Professor	Yes
Research Scientist Research Professor Professor	Clinical Professor	Yes

*Titles of clinical assistant professor and above require a doctorate.

Special note: For transfers of faculty with current tenure track titles, the request must contain a written assurance from the dean that upon the Executive Committees recommendation of the transfer a vacant tenure track position will exist and that as soon as possible or within the next academic year, a search will be authorized to fill the position. Transfers of tenure track faculty to the clinical track shall not result in a net loss in the number of tenure track faculty positions. The replaced position should not be construed to exist automatically in the specialty or department as the one vacated. Clinical track appointments do not carry tenure. Further, university policy pertaining to tenure status shall apply for tenured faculty members transferring to the clinical track.

ADDITIONAL POLICIES REGARDING TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENTS

Probationary Appointments

The purpose of a probationary period for appointees is to assess their academic qualifications and performance skills in terms of the expectations and standards of this institution. Faculty should be informed by the dean or department chair of the length of the probationary period. Appointments and reappointments during a probationary period should be limited.

Joint Appointments

Joint appointments of faculty members to two (2) or more departments of the university are often negotiated. In fact, it is just such appointments that have provided important cross-disciplinary scholarship and teaching, and which have contributed significantly to the university's stature and reputation in these areas. Departments involved in a joint appointment will have proportional responsibility for the faculty member, agreed upon in advance of the appointment between the faculty member and the responsible departments

and reflecting the faculty member's effort or contribution to each of the departments. The salary fraction from each department may be independent of the "effort fraction" because of differing salary scales across departments and colleges. Such an arrangement will be mutually negotiated by all parties involved. The various departments will collaborate and agree on the timing and substance of promotion and tenure decisions. In unusual cases, independent decisions may be reached by the different departments or units that may reflect the faculty member's differing performance in the two (2) or more departments as well as the different criteria for promotion in those departments.

Part-Time Appointments

A part-time appointment, whether an initial appointment or a request for change from full-time to part-time status, will be based upon the needs of the School of Nursing and the individual's qualifications to hold the appointment. All part-time appointments will be reviewed by the head of the immediately responsible unit to determine whether the needs of the school require continuation of the appointment and whether the individual's performance merits an extension of the appointment. If the appointment will not be continued, the individual will be given notice in writing of non-reappointment in conformance with university policy for termination of appointment.

Leaves of Absence

Leaves of absence are an important means of promoting the professional development of faculty members. Their teaching effectiveness is enhanced, scholarly activity enlarged, and the institution's academic program is strengthened.

Leaves of absence are granted to clinical instructional and research faculty who are in pursuit of professional, scholarly, and research goals which will be of compelling benefit to the individual and the school. Leaves of absence will be reviewed and evaluated annually. Leaves of absence without salary may be granted by the president for periods of up to one (1) year. Leaves of absence exceeding one (1) year and extensions of leaves beyond one (1) year for instructional faculty may be granted only by the Board of Regents. Leaves may also be granted for illness, recovery of health, childbearing, and child rearing, and for projected or direct benefit to the institution for public or private service outside the institution. Application for a leave should be made at a reasonable time in advance and through established procedures. The institution is not obliged to assume the financial burden of all types of leaves.

SPG 201.30-1, 'Leaves of Absence without Salary (Instructional)' - <http://www.spg.umich.edu/policy/201.30-1>

201.30-4, 'Scholarly Activity Leave' - <http://www.spg.umich.edu/policy/201.30-4>

ANNUAL REVIEW, END-OF-TERM REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

Preface

Review and promotion are never automatic, nor do they simply depend on length of service or degree obtained. These actions require the recommendation of candidates on the basis of demonstrated merit and specific skills and abilities, which are commensurate with the needs of the School of Nursing. Budgetary constraints, program changes, and shifts in student enrollment are factors affecting reappointment. The university endeavors to recognize distinguished performance by adequate increase in salary and by early promotion. It is expected that members of the clinical track will become more effective teachers, clinicians, and scholars with experience. Therefore, qualifications for review and promotion are progressively more exacting at each rank. Evaluative parameters are further delineated for promotion below.

Annual Review for All Clinical Track Faculty

The vice president for academic affairs encourages each school/college to make a formal review of faculty member's activities each year. This is regarded as particularly helpful in the case of probationary, non-tenured faculty. Internal annual performance reviews of faculty members are conducted by the department chair and the associate dean for undergraduate studies dependent on your reporting line. The faculty member has an opportunity to submit material relevant to the evaluation, which documents the individual's accomplishments in regard to academic and professional responsibilities as well as contributions to the broader goals of the school and the university via the faculty productivity report. Decisions regarding reappointments or non-reappointments are communicated to the faculty member according to established guidelines.

The School of Nursing utilizes a faculty productivity report form to capture and evaluate a faculty member's activities over the past academic year and goals for the future academic year, including activities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and disruptions caused by COVID-19. Please contact your department or the associate dean for undergraduate studies dependent on your reporting line for a copy of this report template.

Yearly, each faculty member is expected to prepare and submit this report along with a copy of their updated curriculum vitae. The department chair or associate dean for undergraduate studies conducts a review of performance, prepares a summary evaluation, and provides a qualitative rating for each faculty member, taking into account academic rank and workload assignment and meets with each faculty member to review performance goals. These finalized reports are submitted to the HR Office and shared with the Dean's Office.

Faculty may use the "Additional Faculty Comments" box on the Faculty Productivity Report Form (Private) to briefly describe (no more than 300 words), how their productivity during the current academic year may have been affected or influenced by

the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty can describe any areas of impact, including scholarship, teaching, and/or service activities. The description of COVID-19 related influences can remain broad, and faculty are not expected to provide sensitive information, but should capture the reason for the disruption. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- How research productivity was greatly reduced due to laboratory or research unit closure, or shelter-in-home requirements for the research team due to the COVID-19 pandemic
- Having to provide dependent care during the COVID-19 pandemic
- How they or their immediate family required care due to COVID-19 infection
- That they were called to full-time clinical practice during the COVID-19 pandemic

End-of-Term Review for the Initial Appointments of Professorial Clinical Track Faculty

For all professorial clinical track appointments, the intent of the end-of-term review is to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or non-reappointment for all initial appointments to the track; to assess the progress of professorial clinical track faculty members; and to provide a recommendation to the Executive Committee for review and decision. If the end-of-term review is successful for a clinical assistant professor, the faculty member will be reappointed for another term-limited period. If the end-of-term review is not successful, written notice will be given to the faculty member noting the fourth year in appointment as the terminal year. If the end-of-term review is successful for a clinical associate professor s/he will be reappointed for another term-limited period based on evidence of appropriate performance, available funding and need. The final determination of a specific term of appointment/re-appointment will be made at the discretion of the dean based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Progression on the clinical track is strongly encouraged, but not mandatory. A successful end-of-term review will be required before a clinical track faculty member at the ranks of clinical assistant professor and clinical associate professor can apply for promotion review.

Additionally, the review aims to help faculty members and their department chairs to strengthen academic achievement and productivity during the remainder of the appointment period. The review is an aid for faculty members and department chairs to assess a faculty member's cumulative development and provide guidance for future directions and support for present directions where possible. The review is not as substantial as that for promotion but is more extensive than the usual annual evaluation conducted by the department chair. The end-of-term review is one (1) of several ongoing evaluations for faculty members and should not in any way constrain or influence the formal reviews for promotion. Participation in the end-of-term review process is required.

Oversight of the End-of-Term Review Process

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of end-of-term review activities for all candidates across the departments in conjunction with the department chair.

Responsibility for facilitating the progress of faculty toward promotion rests with the department chair. The department chair is responsible for ensuring that fair and equitable evaluation of teaching, scholarship, practice, and service are conducted annually and communicated to the faculty member. The Executive Committee believes a mentoring process is most helpful for individuals as they progress in their careers. However, mentor-mentee relationships emerge voluntarily from situations of mutual benefit to both parties and such relationships cannot be mandated or assigned. The department chair is in a position to advise the faculty member of the qualifications and procedures for promotion and review as well as to determine the candidate's readiness for promotion.

Timing of the End-of-Term Review

Typically, the review will be conducted and completed during the professorial clinical track faculty member's third year of appointment. (Note: in the case of budgetary reasons for non-reappointment, the candidate would not be asked to go through an end-of-term review.)

The professorial clinical track faculty member up for end-of-term review should submit a formal notice to his/her department chair and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in writing by February 1 in the faculty member's third year in appointment. The notice will acknowledge that the faculty member will submit his/her materials in accordance with the procedures contained in these guidelines for end-of-term review. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will use this notice to begin the end-of-term review process.

Documents to be Submitted by Candidate for Review

All candidate documents noted below are to be submitted in Word format except publications and teaching evaluations.

1. No later than the last Thursday of April by 12 p.m. the faculty member will submit the following materials via Box, and candidate access will be removed as of that day and time:
 - a. Up-to-date curriculum vitae – with indication of the last time it was updated.
 - e. Self-evaluation – A narrative to include the candidate's: 1) teaching statement; 2) statement of impact of their scholarly work to be the first short paragraph of their scholarship statement; and 3) service statement and that addresses the candidate's plans for development

and work for the remainder of the probationary period; summary of prior work and accomplishments; and summary of evidence of teaching contributions and performance. Also, include a separate summary teaching table listing scores on key questions (Q1, Q2, Q4, Q199, Q217, Q230, Q891, Q1631, Q1632, and Q1633) from the course evaluation forms (E & E forms); the actual instructor with comments report (E & E forms) for each course taught; and a supervisory teaching list including doctoral, master's and undergraduate supervision and role for each, and plans for development and work for the next several years, were the appointment to be renewed. The narrative statement should not exceed five (5) pages. It should be single-spaced, in Word format, with 1-inch margins, 11-point font size in Times New Roman font. A limit of five (5) or fewer pages of additional tables and figures may be used to summarize data.

- b. Evidence of excellence in practice including, but not limited to, annual evaluations from the practice site supervisor, peer evaluations, and proof they have appropriate credentials/privileges to practice at the designated site.
- c. Evidence of their contribution to patient care and/or systems of care that improve safety, quality, and patient outcomes (limit of five (5) pages).
- d. Copies of no more than three (3) representative publications/scholarly products (or those in press) since appointment to a professorial rank within the University of Michigan School of Nursing.
- e. Additional materials as may be relevant to the review; for example, copies of unpublished papers and annual review documents by the department chair of the faculty member.

Process for Review

Submission Requirements:

All faculty will abide by and comply with all submission deadlines. Missed deadlines will halt the process and will jeopardize the candidate's status in the School of Nursing. Only in extreme extenuating circumstances, extensions may be considered upon request to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development from the candidate.

Prior to the submission deadline of materials, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will send out three (3) email reminders to the candidate, copying the department chair:

- The first reminder will be sent two (2) weeks prior to the submission deadline;
- The second reminder will be sent one (1) week prior to the submission deadline; and

- The third reminder will be sent the day prior to the submission deadline.

All required materials are due by the submission deadline. Required materials not submitted by the deadline will halt the process and render the candidate ineligible for review during the current cycle.

As end-of-term review is mandatory, candidates who fail to submit required review materials by the submission deadline will be provided a terminal year. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair via email that the review process has been halted and that the faculty member will receive a formal notice of non-reappointment letter under separate cover, and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office. A meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to discuss the notice of non-reappointment.

Internal Review Committee Selection:

With input from the candidate, the department chair will identify one (1) senior faculty member above the candidate's current rank and preferably on the same track as the candidate within the School of Nursing and/or another school/college at the University of Michigan to conduct the review. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Candidates will be informed of the name of their senior. The candidate may also suggest one (1) name with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not to be asked to serve as an internal reviewer. The associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individual. Together with the department chair, the senior faculty member will form the internal review committee, and each will independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review of the candidate's work using the School of Nursing's promotion criteria. The department chair will notify the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in writing of the senior faculty member selected for each candidate by 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of March.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Note: Executive Committee members and associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the dean and the Executive Committee.

Timetable of Review

Review by the Internal Review Committee:

Candidates' materials will be made available to the internal review committee members via Box on or by May 1.

The internal review committee members will each conduct independent written reviews of the candidate's materials. The department chair will coordinate and arrange a meeting with the senior faculty member to discuss his/her completed draft written recommendation and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise. The senior faculty member will be given an opportunity after the meeting to revise his/her draft letter of recommendation. All recommendations will include an assessment of the faculty member's progress to date at the expected level of functioning the rank including strengths and weaknesses, the potential for continuing development, any areas needing improvement and a clear recommendation for renewal or non-renewal, along with a rationale. The independent written reviews of the senior faculty member and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature.

The internal review committee will finalize their letters of recommendation and submit their recommendations to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development by deadline. The recommendations will be made available to the dean and Executive Committee via Box by 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of August. At that time, candidates will be informed in writing by the department chair of the recommendation going forward to the Executive Committee. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond to the internal review committee, including the department chair's recommendation going forward and to submit supplemental material prior to their final dossier going to the Executive Committee.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

All independent recommendation letters, the candidate's response/rebuttal and any supplemental material will be provided to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development to be included into the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee via Box by the second Monday of September.

Upon dean and Executive Committee written decision/notification to the department chair noted in the 'Review by the Executive Committee' section, a meeting will be arranged by the department chair with the faculty member to discuss reappointment or non-reappointment for another appointment period, progress to date, appropriateness of workload and support available from the department based on the Executive Committee decision/notification. Before the

meeting, the department chair will provide a copy of the Executive Committee's written decision to the candidate for review. The department chair will confirm with the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development in writing that the meeting between the faculty member and department chair has taken place. A copy of the review committee and Executive Committee review letters will remain on file and made available to the Executive Committee at promotion review.

Review by the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee will review all of the faculty member's materials and evaluate the recommendations of the review committee including the department chair to make a recommendation of renewal or non-renewal of appointment to the dean. In the course of its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the internal review committee members (including the senior internal reviewer and/or the department chair) to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. The Executive Committee will finalize their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean by the end of December. The department chair will be notified in writing of the dean and Executive Committee decision at that time.

Note: The final School of Nursing decision on each recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absence of all other parties.

Mock Review

Mock reviews are offered to all clinical associate professors by the Executive Committee. A mock review is available at any time other than the year of application for promotion to clinical professor but is encouraged in the third year after appointment or promotion to clinical associate professor. The mock review is intended to facilitate the most optimal presentation of a faculty member for promotion to clinical professor. The mock review is voluntary and is advisory in nature. In order to encourage these reviews, only a full curriculum vitae and clinically relevant scholarship/publications since appointment to rank are required. A self-evaluation of teaching, scholarship, practice, and service accomplishments may also be submitted. No copies of the written summary by the Executive Committee will be placed in the School's files.

Promotion Review for Clinical Track Faculty

Important information regarding the University of Michigan's requirements and procedures for promotions can be found on the provost's website at:

http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/

and should be carefully reviewed in addition to the School of Nursing information presented below.

In making their recommendation for promotion, the responsible departments and colleges will study the whole record of each candidate. To warrant recommendation for promotions, candidates must have shown superior ability in at least one phase of their activities and substantial contribution in other phases. Naturally, persons who make a distinguished contribution in all aspects of their work may expect more rapid promotion than persons of more limited achievement. – *Promotion Guidelines, Attachment A, Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Several Faculties of the University of Michigan*

Application of Promotion Criteria

The purpose for establishing a clinical track in the School of Nursing is to secure appropriate faculty resources to assure the delivery of high-quality programs of undergraduate and graduate clinical education and scholarship. The School's instructional resources can be strengthened and diversified with clinical track faculty who possess current, high quality clinical expertise. These faculty will have various backgrounds, knowledge and skills and evaluating their teaching, practice and scholarship is expected to be rigorous using criteria consistent with their focus and expertise. Listed below are the criteria as listed in the School of Nursing Faculty Handbook for appointment at various clinical track ranks, with examples cited to provide guidance in evaluation. *The indicators listed under each criterion are not meant to be considered as a checklist, but rather are designed to clarify existing criteria of the School of Nursing. The examples are not meant to be prescriptive nor exhaustive.* Clinical scholarship for some may involve contributing to scholarly publications and scientific discovery while for others may involve development and evaluation of innovative programs of clinical care delivery for specialized patient populations. It is likely that the examples will expand as the clinical track develops.

Promotion to Clinical Professor

1. (Criteria) Minimum of three years teaching experience as a clinical associate professor and a sustained record of excellence in clinically relevant teaching, including experience with advanced students (this includes digital/remote instruction). Examples include:
 - Pattern of sustained excellence in clinical teaching across all levels (undergraduate and graduate) since last promotion documented by the University of Michigan Office of Evaluations and Examinations Teaching Questionnaire ratings (with explanation of any less than satisfactory ratings);
 - Master teacher documented by peer evaluation;
 - Student educational and professional accomplishments that serve as indicators of teaching effectiveness, e.g., awards, poster presentations;
 - Chairs scholarly project work to completion of two (2) or more DNP students; also serves on additional scholarly project committees;

- Sustained record of multiple, completed master's and DNP students' projects;
 - Evidence of sustained involvement in student advisement, informal teaching, mentoring and precepting of students at all levels (e.g., Honors, UROP, diversity and summer programs, preceptorship of DNP students, may include entrepreneurial and public service activities);
 - Leads the development of new educational programs, new curricula, new instructional methods;
 - Serves as a curricular consultant to other universities;
 - Is invited to provide instruction to other organizations;
 - Structures systems for integrating programs of clinical practice and education;
 - Impact of clinical teaching is recognized at the national and international level.
2. (Criteria) Evidence of national and preferably international clinically relevant leadership and practice excellence. Examples include:
- Provides leadership/mentorship/consultation in practice development;
 - Leads setting practice standards at national/international level;
 - Leads or contributes to determining practice outcomes at national/international level;
 - Participation in national guidelines and/or setting of standards (clinical and/or education);
 - Designs and evaluates innovative systems of care delivery;
 - Serves in a leadership capacity for national or international professional practice organizations;
 - Creates new or enhanced practices, products, or services
 - Creates patient and community education products
3. (Criteria) Evidence of sustained national and preferably international clinical scholarship. Examples include:
- Designs and evaluates systems of care for complex clinical populations/problems within chosen area of clinical interest;
 - Leads multi-site/system-wide demonstration/evaluation projects to address complex clinical issues;
 - Impacts public policy within chosen area of clinical interest;
 - Maintains peer reviewed clinically relevant publication productivity;
 - Develops collaborative approaches to solving complex world problems;
 - Translates research into practice for national and international impact;
 - Participates and contributes to comparative effectiveness research;
 - Leads national initiatives to improve the health of the community.
4. (Criteria) Evidence of national leadership in service to the profession and academic community. Examples include:
- A continuing record of recognized accomplishments in academic, professional and community service through the contribution of clinically relevant expertise:

- Academic
School committees'/task forces (membership/leadership)
University committee (membership/leadership)
Clinically relevant practice
Consultation
- Professional
Member of editorial boards
Professional organization (officer, chair, member)
Clinically relevant practice
Consultation
Workshop (leader/development)
- Community Service
Advisory/policy board (state, national, international)
Consultation
Workshop (leader/development)

Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

1. (Criteria) Evidence of excellence in clinically relevant teaching. Examples include:
 - Sustained pattern of teaching excellence;
 - Mentors junior clinical track faculty in the area of teaching;
 - Leads curricular changes and innovations;
 - Chairs student scholarly projects at graduate and undergraduate levels;
 - Evidence of sustained involvement in student advisement, informal teaching, mentoring, and precepting of students at all levels (e.g., Honors, UROP, diversity and summer programs, research preceptorship, and pre-doctoral research experience; may include entrepreneurial and public service activities);
 - Documentation of contributions and innovations to curriculum (e.g., development of courses, seminars, lectures, guest lectures, new teaching aides, new instructional methods, service-learning opportunities, computer-aided instruction, digital/remote instruction, interdisciplinary and interprofessional courses or lectures).
2. (Criteria) Evidence of effective clinically relevant program development. Examples include:
 - Leads an identified cohort of clinical scholars and students to improve care delivery and patient outcomes;
 - Mentors clinical colleagues and students;
 - Implements/evaluates standards of practice at state/local/national level;
 - Develops and evaluates practice innovations and improvements in care delivery based on the latest evidence/research findings;
 - Clinical consultant within and outside of practice setting, including at the national level;
 - Designs, tests models of care;
 - Provides leadership for revisions of clinical practice standards;

- Provides leadership in practice for implementation and evaluation of practice standards.
3. (Criteria) Sustained clinically relevant scholarship. Examples include:
- Develops program of clinically relevant scholarship as evidenced by a body of peer reviewed abstracts, articles, keynote addresses and invited presentations;
 - Designs programs of care for clinical populations/problems;
 - Impacts local policy in area of clinical expertise;
 - Publishes clinically relevant articles in peer-reviewed journals;
 - Collaborates/participates in clinically relevant data-based research;
 - Serves as PI of demonstration or evaluation projects;
 - Develops protocols relating to clinical expertise;
 - Disseminates findings in national venues (conferences, journals);
 - Demonstrates impact at state and national level;
 - Leads development of training grants as related to expertise;
 - Serves as faculty on interdisciplinary and interprofessional training programs.
4. (Criteria) Evidence of substantial service to the profession and academic community. Examples include:
- An admirable record of academic, professional and community service:
 - Academic
School committees'/task forces (membership/leadership)
University committee (membership)
Clinically relevant practice
Consultation
 - Professional
Reviewer for refereed journal(s)
Professional organization (section chair, member)
Clinically relevant practice
Consultation
Workshop (leader/development)
 - Community Service
Advisory/policy board (local, state, national)
Consultation
Workshop (leader/development)

Oversight of the Promotion Process

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of promotion activities for all candidates across the departments in the School of Nursing. In fall (September/October) of each year, in conjunction with the Dean's Office, the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will publish the annual calendar for promotion and/or tenure dates. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development does not review the candidate's dossier nor makes a recommendation regarding promotion.

Initiation for the Review for Promotion

By February 1, after discussion with their department chair, professorial faculty applicants will declare in writing their intent to apply for promotion in September of the following academic year to the chair of their department and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. The written intent will include whether the faculty applicant has a joint faculty appointment (with effort or dry (0%)) on the tenure track, clinical track and/or research tracks in another unit on campus and the relevant unit contact information of the faculty administrator (i.e., department chair, associate dean, director, etc.).

The candidate, the department chair and associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development reviews the request and, if agreement is reached, the applicant follows the procedures for compiling and submitting the necessary materials. In the event that the immediate supervisor does not approve the request, an explanation will be given in writing to the candidate. The faculty member is free to proceed with the application for promotion if the candidate is convinced of his/her readiness for promotion consideration.

Responsibility for facilitating the progress of faculty toward promotion rests with the department chair. The department chair is responsible for ensuring that fair and equitable evaluation of teaching, research, and service are conducted annually and communicated to the faculty member. The Executive Committee believes a mentoring process is most helpful for individuals as they progress in their careers. However, mentor-mentee relationships emerge voluntarily from situations of mutual benefit to both parties and such relationships cannot be mandated or assigned. The department chair is in a position to advise the faculty of mentorship opportunities, (e.g., names within the School of Nursing or on University of Michigan campus, professional development workshops, etc.) recognizing faculty may need multiple mentors (teaching, service, scholarship), and qualifications and procedures for promotion and review as well as to determine the candidate's readiness for promotion. The recommendation for promotion developed by the review committee, including the department chair must address the candidate's readiness for promotion and be applicable to the rank for which the applicant is to be considered. Note that promotion is never automatic, nor does it simply depend on length of service or degree obtained but is based on demonstrated merit and specific skills and abilities, which are commensurate with the needs of the School of Nursing.

Submitting a Dossier for Promotion Review as a Clinical Assistant Professor

The intent of this policy is transparency, fairness across tracks and fairness across individuals in review processes. This school policy and procedure is complementary to existing university and school policies and do not displace policies and procedures for review/timeline extensions.

Clinical Assistant Professors who have completed a successful end-of-term review and who have been reappointed, do not have a mandatory promotion timeline; instead it is strongly encouraged and customary within our school that they go up for promotion review. Clinical Assistant Professors who choose to submit their dossier for promotion review, and if after Executive Committee review, a positive/supportive recommendation is rendered, the candidate dossier along with a positive/supportive recommendation will be advanced to the Office of the Provost for review. However, if after Executive Committee review, a negative/non-supportive recommendation is rendered, a negative vote will be recorded in the meeting minutes. The dossier will not be forwarded to the Office of the Provost and the candidate will remain in their current rank for the balance of their current contract, with the possibility of renewal by mutual agreement. The dean may or may not offer the faculty member the option to resubmit a dossier for promotion in a future promotion cycle. A maximum of two submissions for promotion may be allowed. Submissions must be within a current contract period and cannot be submitted in consecutive academic years.

Faculty applicants who declare their intent to apply for promotion review in an earlier promotion cycle (a promotion cycle before their mandatory scheduled review) can withdraw their intent to apply for promotion between February 1 and 12 p.m. the last Thursday of March. The withdraw of intent to apply for early promotion review can be done once, unless exception approval from the department chair, dean and Executive Committee is obtained and the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development is consulted.

Questions regarding the process, should be directed to the department chair and/or the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development.

Documents to be Submitted by Candidate for Review

The applicant should submit documentation and evidence of strengths in teaching, scholarship, and community service, selecting the areas applicable for the rank for which the candidate is applying. All documents must be in portrait format with the exception of course evaluation forms (E & E forms). Excel spreadsheets are not permissible as part of dossier materials.

1. Up-to-date curriculum vitae – with indication of the last time it was updated.
2. List of names of external reviewers – The candidate will submit no more than three (3) names of arm's length external reviewers* who may be willing to provide recommendations upon inquiry to the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development and the department chair. It is possible that an additional two (2) arm's length external reviewer names will be requested from the candidate but should not be supplied unless requested. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):
 - a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address

- b. Short paragraph on each external reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The candidate may also suggest up to two (2) names with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not be asked to provide letters of recommendation. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individuals.

The department chair, in conjunction with the candidate's advocate and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewer names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. [External reviewers outside the U.S. will not be solicited.](#) Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will select individuals from the list provided by the candidate but reserves the right to ask other reviewers because of inability of the listed reviewers to complete the reviews or for other reasons. In such cases, the promotion applicant will be informed.

* All external reviewers must be "arm's length" and be at or above the rank of the appointment being considered and from schools of similar stature. Emeriti and adjunct faculty are not eligible to serve as external reviewers. Clinical track candidates can have tenure track or clinical reviewers. The University of Michigan policy states that arm's length reviews should come from individuals outside the present institution of the candidate and from individuals who have not worked or trained with the candidate at other institutions. Close collaborators, present or former advisors/mentors/teachers/supervisors, present colleagues, and close personal friends are not allowed. Co-authors and major research collaborators, or former colleagues are only allowed if it has been more than 10 years since they have worked with the candidate. Letters from persons who have served on a candidate's thesis or dissertation committee are not considered "arm's length." When both an outside reviewer and the candidate are members of the

same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an “arm’s length” reviewer if s/he and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort (the absence of a direct collaboration must be documented in these cases). For clinical faculty only, it is allowable to have two (2) of the five “arm’s length” letters from local sources. The two (2) letters from local sources can be from the candidate's current institution as long as the local sources are outside of the candidate's department and have seen the clinical work and actual teaching but are not mentors or scholarly collaborators. The reviewers should be individuals in the relevant field who can critique a candidate’s work and scholarly contributions and be able to provide a truly evaluative and unbiased assessment. The reviews of greatest value are from people who may be unknown to the candidate but have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications.

3. Scholarly Products - Five (5) pieces of the candidate's best scholarly products are included, with emphasis on the most recent or most representative since appointed or promoted to current professorial rank within the University of Michigan School of Nursing. The candidate provides notes on each of the five (5) items. This is a single page per paper that explains why the candidate selected the item, any unique or seminal contributions of the item to nursing science, the impact factor, journal significance and in the case of multiple-authored items, provides an explanation of the candidate's contribution. The citation survey may be used to demonstrate impact of any papers.
4. Self-evaluation - A narrative summarizing evidence that the candidate meets the criteria for the rank sought. To include the candidate’s:
 - a. Teaching statement (including contributions to interdisciplinary and interprofessional teaching, if relevant),
 - b. Scholarship statement (including a statement of impact of the candidate’s scholarly work to be the first short paragraph of the statement; and contributions to interdisciplinary and interprofessional research, if relevant), and
 - c. Service statement

The narrative statement should not exceed five (5) pages. It should be single-spaced, in Word format, with 1-inch margins, 11-point font size in Times New Roman font. A limit of five (5) or fewer pages of additional tables and figures may be used to summarize data.
5. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness:
 - a. Summary teaching table (use the Provost Office approved template) listing scores on key questions (Q1, Q2, Q4, Q199, Q217, Q 230, Q891, Q1631, Q1632, and Q1633) from the course evaluations forms (E & E forms).
 - b. Instructor with comments report (E & E forms) for each course taught.
 - c. Supervisory teaching list including doctoral, master’s and undergraduate supervision and role for each.
 - d. If teaching takes place outside the traditional classroom, explain the context in which it occurs and how it is evaluated in terms of both quantity

- and quality.
- e. Additional materials in line with the teaching portfolio recommended by the Provost Office are encouraged.
6. Other materials may be requested by the review committee and/or Executive Committee.

Process for Review

Submission Requirements:

All faculty will abide by and comply with all submission deadlines. Missed deadlines will halt the process and will jeopardize the candidate's status in the School of Nursing. Only in extreme extenuating circumstances, extensions may be considered upon request to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development from the candidate.

Prior to the submission deadline of materials, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will send out three (3) email reminders to the candidate, copying the department chair:

- The first reminder will be sent two (2) weeks prior to the submission deadline;
- The second reminder will be sent one (1) week prior to the submission deadline; and
- The third reminder will be sent the day prior to the submission deadline.

All required materials are due by the submission deadline. Required materials not submitted by the deadline will halt the process and render the candidate ineligible for review during the current cycle.

Candidates who fail to submit required review materials by the submission due date will not be reviewed during the current review cycle in which they declared their intention. The candidate will have an opportunity to declare their intention to apply for promotion during the next review cycle. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair via email that the review process has been halted and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office.

Advocate Selection:

During the month of February, the candidate and the department chair select an advocate and then notify the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development of the faculty member selected by February 28. The advocate should be a senior faculty member at or above the rank being considered who knows the candidate and his/her scholarship and can work closely with the candidate to assemble the necessary credentials.

Internal Review Committee Selection:

With input from the candidate and potentially the advocate, the department chair and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will identify at least two (2) faculty members at or above the rank being considered, preferably in the department and on the same track as the candidate within the School of Nursing and/or another school/college at the University of Michigan by 12 p.m. the last Thursday of March. In the case of clinical instructor to clinical assistant professor promotion reviews, one (1) of the two (2) faculty members identified could be at the rank of assistant professor or clinical assistant professor if s/he has completed a successful end-of-term review. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Candidates will be informed of who their internal reviewers are. Together with the department chair, the two (2) senior faculty members will form the review committee. Each member of the review committee will independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review of the candidate's work using the School of Nursing's promotion and tenure criteria. The candidate may also suggest up to one (1) name with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not to be asked to serve as an internal reviewer. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individual.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Note: Executive Committee members are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the Executive Committee.

List of External Reviewers:

By April 1, the candidate will submit the names of no more than three (3) arm's length external reviewers to their department chair. The department chair, in conjunction with the candidate's advocate and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewer names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development by April 1. External reviewers outside the U.S. will not be solicited. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address

- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development can add or remove names from the combined list and will approve the initial list by May 1.

The finalized list of external reviewers who will be contacted for agreement to review and write a recommendation letter, have agreed or not agreed to provide a recommendation, and the subsequent recommendations received by the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development will be held confidential for use only during the promotion review process; and no contact between the external reviewer and the candidate should take place.

When all candidates have declared their intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure and department chairs have submitted the combined list of external reviewers to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development, the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will receive the compiled lists and determine who should be contacted for external review letters and will send letters of request to the external reviewers in May or early June.

All external review letters need to be received at the School of Nursing by the last Friday of August. External letters will be sent to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development to compile into the candidate's dossier. Once all external review letters have been received and the candidate's dossier is complete, it will be given to the review committee for their evaluation and recommendation.

Candidate's Dossier to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development:

The application for promotion and candidate's completed dossiers to be reviewed, should be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development via Box by no later than the last Thursday of May by 12 p.m. The candidate's access to the Box site will be removed after 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of May.

Timetable of Review

Careful and intensive review of all credentials of candidates by the School, including external recommendations, requires advanced planning and a timetable which will ensure that the recommendations for promotion are received by the provost, president and the regents in advance of their scheduled meetings each year.

Review by the Internal Review Committee:

Review committee members, including the department chair will each conduct independent written reviews of the candidate's materials that includes completing the 'External Reviewer Summary of Comments Worksheet' as required by the Provost Office; will meet as a group to discuss their completed written reviews, and have the opportunity after the group meeting to revise their letter of recommendation before final submission of the letters to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development no later than by 12 p.m. on the second Thursday of October. The department chair will coordinate and arrange the meeting of the review committee to discuss their completed reviews including the external reviewer assessments and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise before the October deadline. The independent written reviews of the review committee and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature. All recommendation letters should reflect a candid review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that arose through the review process, include comments from all external reviewer recommendations, address any areas needing improvement and distill to a clear recommendation. All independent recommendation letters as well as the consolidated 'External Reviewer Summary Comments Worksheet' will be included in the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee. Candidates will not be informed of the recommendations from the review committee or department chair to the dean and Executive Committee.

It should be noted that candidates have the ability to submit new and relevant information (such as funded grants, accepted publications, etc.) at any time in the process.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the ['Internal Reviewer Policy'](#).

Review by the Dean and Executive Committee:

The dean and the Executive Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of all candidate dossiers and the independent recommendations of the review committee members including the department chair and the consolidated 'External Reviewer Summary of Comments Worksheet' in November. During its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the review committee members including the department chair to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. The dean and Executive Committee will then draft a preliminary recommendation to the candidate by December that includes gaps as well as requests for clarification and/or additional information. Candidates have until January 1 to respond to the preliminary recommendation and provide the required clarifications and/or additional information. During this time, the dean and the Executive Committee may also

return a recommendation to a review committee member with specific instructions for further review.

The Executive Committee will finalize their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean by February 1. At that time, candidates will be informed in writing only of the recommendation going forward and a meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to go over the outcome of the review. The candidate has an opportunity to submit supplemental material prior to their file going to the Provost's Office. The final School of Nursing decision on each recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absence of all other parties.

Since promotion review on the clinical track is not mandatory, but strongly encouraged, if the recommendation of the dean and Executive Committee is not to promote, the candidate's dossier will not be forwarded to the Provost Office and the candidate will remain in his/her current rank for the balance of his/her current contract, with the possibility of renewal by mutual agreement.

The HR Office and the Dean's Office will work together to ensure that all required elements are submitted to the Provost's Office by the deadline.

Review by University Officials:

As with appointments, all recommendations of the dean and the Executive Committee concerning re-appointment and promotion, in order to be implemented as recommended, require the approval of the appropriate university officials.

Recommendation to the Provost by February 1:

The provost forwards all recommendations for promotion to the clinical associate professor and clinical professor ranks to the Regents for final action on recommendations for promotions.

Notification of Final Decision:

Notification of candidate - The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the recommendation of the Executive Committee. At a later date, the dean will notify the candidate and her/his chair of the recommendations of the provost and, if applicable, of the final decision of the Board of Regents. The candidate may request clarification of these decisions in conference with the dean or the Executive Committee.

Note: If successfully promoted, the final determination of a specific term of appointment/re-appointment will be made at the discretion of the dean based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

TERMINATION OF APPOINTMENT, DENIAL OF PROMOTION, THE APPEAL PROCESS, AND ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS

Preface

The establishment of a probationary period and a commitment to make a decision regarding reappointment and/or promotion in advance of the end of the probationary period, as well as the implementation of an annual review and evaluation are efforts to: 1) create a fair system with effective appointment, promotion and tenure policies and practices, and 2) promote the recognition of the achievement of all who meet the criteria and standards for promotion.

Termination or Notice of Non-reappointment

Clinical track instructional faculty with less than one (1) year of continuous service will be given notice of non-reappointment at least three months before the scheduled expiration of that appointment. Faculty members with more than one (1) year, but less than two (2) years, of continuous service should be given notice of non-reappointment by December 15 if the appointment expires at the end of the winter term or if the appointment expires on a date other than at the end of winter term. Faculty members whose years of continuous service have extended beyond two (2) years should be given notice of non-reappointment by September 15 if the appointment expires at the end of winter term or no later than the date, that would provide nine months' advance notice.

SPG 201.88, 'Notice of Non-reappointment' - <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.88>

Academic Appointments: Pay Schedules – Resignation/Termination – Benefits

Pay Schedules:

Faculty members typically hold either University-year (Academic-year, nine-month) or twelve-month appointments. University-year appointees begin on the last Monday of August or January 1 and receive their salary payments allocated on a fiscal year basis (July 1 – June 30) for a nine-month (last Monday of August – May 31) appointment on the last working day of the month. For new University-year appointees who begin the last Monday of August, three payments (pre-payments for July/August and regular payment for September) will be received in the end of September payment. Twelve-month appointees can begin on any date of the month, and receive 12 monthly salary payments, payable on the last working day of the month.

U-M Faculty Handbook, 14.C Salary Payments –
<http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/14/14.C.html>

Resignation/Termination:

Resignation of a faculty member within the term of appointment requires proper notice. Resigning faculty are expected to provide adequate formal written notice (prior to April 1 for the following academic year) of their intent to resign to their department chair and/or associate dean. This notice needs to be done prior to the effective date of resignation and preferably a full term (four months) in advance in order to avoid possible overpayments and discontinuance of benefits eligibility.

For University-year appointees, the last day of work upon resignation must be either December 31 or May 31. For December 31 resignations the last paycheck will be issued at the end of December and benefits will terminate on December 31. For May 31 resignations the last paycheck will be issued at the end of June and benefits terminate on May 31. For University-year appointees, if resignation comes at another point beyond April 1 there may be consequences related to pay and/or benefits depending on the selected appointment end date, including the faculty member being responsible for repaying the 'pre-payments' for July and/or August, and/or regular payments received for the following academic year. For twelve-month appointees, the last day of work upon resignation must be the last day of the month. For twelve-month appointments, if the faculty member resigns at another point in the academic year, a proration of salary payment will take place. Therefore, prior to April 1 notice is preferred.

Faculty members are asked to contact their department chair or associate dean, and/or the human resources office with questions.

SPG 201.40, 'Termination of Employment' - <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.40>

Academic Appointments Manual, 'Termination and Non-Reappointment' - <http://hr.umich.edu/acadhr/personnelmanual/changes/termination.html>

Employment Benefits:

For a new hire and/or newly eligible faculty member benefits eligibility begins on the first day of appointment. Specific benefits options will be shown on Employee Self-Service > Benefits on Wolverine Access (<https://wolverineaccess.umich.edu>) after the faculty member's appointment is processed and on the employment system. A faculty member will receive a notification email to go into Employee Self-Service to make benefits selections online. Generally, faculty members have 30 days from their service date or the date they become newly eligible to make benefits elections. Once benefits elections are made online, they remain until the next open enrollment period (normally in October each year), with changes effective January 1. Once a faculty member makes his/her benefits elections and they are confirmed online, a faculty member may not make any changes (even within the 30-day enrollment period) unless there is a qualifying family status change.

The University of Michigan and/or the School of Nursing is not responsible for benefits after the date of termination. Faculty who may have a gap in their benefits coverage should consider COBRA coverage or contact their new institution regarding benefits enrollment.

For questions related to benefits go to the U-M Benefits Office website - <https://hr.umich.edu/benefits-wellness>.

Denial of Promotion and the Appeal Process

An applicant for reappointment or promotion who is not satisfied, on procedural grounds, with the decision of the dean and the Executive Committee may initiate a formal appeal of the promotion review. The appeal procedure follows the established lines of administrative organization within the School of Nursing and the University of Michigan. The School of Nursing grievance procedures are presented in Appendix A.

RESEARCH TRACK FACULTY

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS TO THE RESEARCH TRACKS

Research faculty conduct research as their main academic activity and usually have a doctoral degree or equivalent education and experience. All research faculty should be capable of conducting research of the highest quality and of working independently.

The criteria for appointment and promotion to research faculty ranks are defined using four fundamental characteristics of all faculty positions: scholarship, teaching, independence, and service. The research scientist track is differentiated from the research professor track based on all four criteria. The level of and potential for scholarship and independence differs between the tracks. Teaching and service are not required activities for any rank in the research scientist track.

For all research faculty appointments, it is expected that 100% of School of Nursing salary support will come from external sources, such as sponsored research grants. Dry appointments (without funds) may continue between and after specific projects.

Appointees to research faculty positions shall generally possess the following qualifications:

1. Have an earned doctorate or terminal degree in their respective profession or discipline;
2. Have a record of scholarship that justifies appointment to the assigned rank of the position;
3. Have demonstrated the competence required to assume major responsibility for the performance of a research investigation in a relevant field of research;
4. Have demonstrated personal characteristics consistent with good scholarship and professionalism.

In making appointment and promotion decisions, the Executive Committee and the dean shall use the research faculty criteria defined below as provided by the University of Michigan Office of Research (UMOR). Appointments may be made in the research scientist or the research professor tracks. Research professor positions require a significantly higher degree of qualification on the part of the candidate and promote higher expectations for future academic and research activity. Research scientist and research professor track appointments are not appointments to the tenured or tenure-track instructional faculty.

Important information regarding the University of Michigan's requirements and procedures for appointments and promotions for the research scientist and research professor tracks can be found on the provost's website at:

http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/appointment_guidelines/ (for appointments)
http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/promotion_guidelines/ (for promotions)

as well as on the vice president for research's website at:

<https://research.umich.edu/policies-on-appointments-and-promotions-for-research-scientist-track/> (for appointments/promotions)
https://www.research.umich.edu/sites/default/files/resource-download/rsch_faculty_appt_promo_criteria_2020_0.pdf (for appointment/promotion criteria grid)

and should be carefully reviewed in addition to the School of Nursing information presented below.

RESEARCH PROFESSORIAL TRACK:

Research Professor

The title of research professor is accorded to the person who has met the requirements for research associate professor and who has:

1. Scholarship
 - i. Exemplary and sustained national and international reputation and achievements equivalent to a tenured professor
2. Independence
 - i. Independent scholarship and sustained funding
3. Teaching
 - i. A record of substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level within the context of one or more research fields
4. Service
 - i. Substantial record of internal service (less than tenure track), external service expected

Initial appointment to the title of research professor is made for a period of three years unless appointed as term-limited. In the third year of appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided.

Qualifications for appointment to this rank include a doctoral degree or its equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Appointment and/or promotion to the title of research professor requires the approval of the provost on recommendation of the dean, the Executive Committee, and the review and consent of the vice president for research. There is no limit to the amount of time a research professor can remain in rank.

Research Associate Professor

The title of research associate professor is accorded to the person who has met the requirements for research assistant professor and who has:

1. Scholarship
 - i. Strong local and national reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years consistent with that of a tenured associate professor;
 - ii. Substantial record of peer-reviewed publication;
 - iii. Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings
2. Independence
 - i. Independent scholarship and funding
3. Teaching
 - i. A record of substantial non-didactic teaching and mentoring of postdoctoral fellows, junior research colleagues, or students at any level within the context of one or more research fields
4. Service
 - i. Substantial record of internal service (less than tenure track), some external service

Initial appointment to the title of research associate professor is made for a period of three years unless appointed as term-limited. In the third year of appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided.

Qualifications for appointment to this rank include a doctoral degree or its equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Appointment and/or promotion to the title of research associate professor requires the approval of the provost on recommendation of the dean, the Executive Committee, and the review and consent of the vice president for research. There is no limit to the amount of time a research associate professor can remain in rank.

Research Assistant Professor

The title of research assistant professor is accorded to the person who has:

1. Scholarship
 - i. Strong local and growing national scholarly reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years;
 - ii. Record of peer-reviewed publications in which they are a primary author or co-author;
 - iii. Potential to develop a scholarly reputation at a rate that is consistent with that of an assistant professor on the tenure track;
 - iv. Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings
2. Independence

- i. Plans and development for independence;
 - ii. Potential to develop a substantial independent research program
- 3. Teaching
 - i. No formal requirement for teaching;
 - ii. Potential to develop a substantial record of non-didactic teaching
- 4. Service
 - i. No requirement

Initial appointment to the title of research assistant professor is made for a period of three years unless appointed as term-limited. In the third year of appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. Successful individuals are then expected to go up for promotion to research associate professor no later than their sixth year. If unsuccessful in achieving promotion, a terminal year is provided effective the September following the decision.

Qualifications for appointment to this rank include a doctoral degree or its equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Appointment to the title of research assistant professor requires the approval of the dean and the Executive Committee.

RESEARCH SCIENTIST TRACK:

Research Scientist

The title of research scientist is accorded to the person who has met the requirements for associate research scientist and who has:

- 1. Scholarship
 - i. Strong national and international scholarly reputation on the basis of sustained research productivity and contributions;
 - ii. Substantial record of peer-reviewed publications;
 - iii. Significant, sustained participation in relevant academic or professional meetings
- 2. Independence
 - i. A record of independent scholarship and funding
- 3. Teaching
 - i. No formal teaching requirement
- 4. Service
 - i. Significant internal institutional service; some external expected

Initial appointment to the title of research scientist is made for a period of three years unless appointed as term-limited. In the third year of appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided.

Qualifications for appointment to this rank include a doctoral degree or its equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Appointment and/or promotion to the title of research scientist requires the approval of the vice president for research on recommendation of the dean and the Executive Committee. There is no limit to the amount of time a research scientist can remain in rank.

Associate Research Scientist

The title of associate research scientist is accorded to the person who has met the requirements for assistant research scientist and who has:

1. Scholarship
 - i. Strong local and growing national scholarly reputation on the basis of research productivity and contributions over several years, possibly as part of a larger research program;
 - ii. Record of peer-reviewed publications in which they are a primary author or co-author;
 - iii. Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings
2. Independence
 - i. Independence not required but may be developing
3. Teaching
 - i. No formal teaching requirement
4. Service
 - i. No formal service requirement

Initial appointment to the title of associate research scientist is made for a period of three years unless appointed as term-limited. In the third year of appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. If unsuccessful in achieving reappointment, a terminal year is provided.

Qualifications for appointment to this rank include a doctoral degree or its equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Appointment and/or promotion to the title of associate research scientist requires the approval of the vice president for research on recommendation of the dean and the Executive Committee. There is no limit to the amount of time an associate research scientist can remain in rank.

Assistant Research Scientist

The title of assistant research scientist is accorded to the person who has:

1. Scholarship
 - i. Potential for scholarly development, possibly as part of a larger research program;
 - ii. Record of peer-reviewed publications in which they are primary author or co-author;
 - iii. Participation in relevant academic or professional meetings

2. Independence
 - i. Independence not required or planned for;
 - ii. Plan for a supporting role
3. Teaching
 - i. No formal teaching requirement
4. Service
 - i. No formal service requirement;
 - ii. Provide evidence of participation in relevant academic or professional settings

Initial appointment to the title of assistant research scientist is made for a period of three years unless appointed as term-limited. In the third year of appointment, an end-of-term review is conducted to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or termination. Successful individuals are then expected to go up for promotion to associate research scientist no later than their sixth year. If unsuccessful in achieving promotion, a terminal year is provided effective the September following the decision.

Qualifications for appointment to this rank include a doctoral degree or its equivalent. For some positions, a graduate degree in nursing may be required.

Appointment to the title of assistant research scientist requires the approval of the dean and the Executive Committee.

Research Investigator

Appointment at the research investigator level allows the investigator to work with a senior colleague to gain research experience and show evidence of growth as an investigator.

The title of research investigator is accorded to the person who is entering the field of research. A research investigator should have:

1. Scholarship
 - i. Scholarly reputation equivalent to a person who has recently completed a doctoral, PhD or equivalent, and/or post-doctoral training
2. Independence
 - i. Independence not required, but may be a goal of training;
 - ii. Plan for a supporting role
3. Teaching
 - i. No teaching requirement
4. Service
 - i. No service requirement

Maximum time-in-rank is up to four years without promotion. Appointment to the title of research investigator requires the approval of the university on recommendation of the dean and the Executive Committee.

EXPECTATIONS REGARDING APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

Research faculty productivity is examined primarily in relation to research activities and publications. As members of the professional scientific community, a reasonable level of service is also expected. In the unusual circumstance when teaching formal courses is a part of the research academic load, specific time should be allocated for this activity in addition to time committed to research activities. In the rare case where research faculty would be assigned to a formal, reoccurring course load, they would then be appointed concurrently to the rank of lecturer and for a time-limited duration with the primary appointment. It is not the intent of such a practice to permit the appointment of individuals to instructional ranks via an alternative process of review and consideration.

Each year, research faculty with 50% appointments or greater who have been faculty for at least one (1) year are invited to become members of the governing faculty. Current governing faculty vote on whether such status will be extended to those who qualify. As governing faculty, research faculty attend all-school faculty meetings and hold voting privileges on issues relevant to their track. Research faculty are eligible for membership on committees and task forces relevant to their roles in both the School of Nursing and the university.

Research and Scholarly Contribution

The basic expressions of a research faculty member's scholarly work are found in peer-reviewed publications authored and/or co-authored by the research faculty member. In evaluating the scholarly merit of publications, a major consideration is the level of the researcher's participation in, and contributions to, the work, especially multi-authored contributions. Peer-reviewed publications are generally expected and preferred. If non peer-reviewed work is offered as part of the portfolio, the School of Nursing would seek an assessment of its academic contribution from external reviewers.

It is expected that nominees for the senior ranks (associate and above) will have achieved a level of national or international recognition in their fields. "National and international recognition" means that leaders in the field are able to recognize excellence in the nominee's published work, and to identify contributions he or she has made to the field. National and international recognition is judged primarily from the responses provided by external "arms-length" reviewers. Additional information may also be obtained based on the frequency of citations of an individual's publications in the appropriate citation indexes for the field of study.

A record of research funding as a principal investigator from outside sources does not, by itself, guarantee research competence, just as inability to attract research funding does not necessarily demonstrate a lack of research competence. On balance, however, a record of peer-reviewed research funding reflects well on the nominee's standing in the scientific community, and funded research of various types provides evidence that the nominee has satisfied the first two criteria for advancement. Having secured research funding reflects particular credit on the nominee when he or she has obtained it through a competitive,

peer-reviewed process at the national level, such as that required by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF).

Independence

The scholarly independence of a faculty member is evidenced when he or she undertakes leadership in the conception, execution, and dissemination through publication of important scholarly work. Candidates can demonstrate this by serving as the Principal Investigator on research projects, by serving as the sole author, lead author, or primary author on a fair proportion of publications, by demonstrating other major contributions to the preparation of manuscripts, and by achieving recognition from their peer group through invited lectures, awards, etc. Comments from external reviewers are also used as a measure of the nominee's creativity, initiative and productivity that can reveal the level and growth of a faculty's scholarly independence.

Service

Nominees will have demonstrated a reasonable level of contribution to service at various levels, such as their departments, the school, or the University as a whole, as well as in various activities at community, state, national, or international levels.

Teaching

Research Scientist faculty appointments are intended for individuals whose primary activity is research. Faculty appointed on the Research Professor Track are expected to participate in significant levels of non-didactic teaching.

If a research faculty member takes part in instructional track teaching while holding a research faculty appointment, it is expected that the research faculty member will have a fractional instructional appointment for the teaching. Appointments to non-tenure track instructional titles covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the Lecturers' Employee Organization (LEO) are governed by the terms of that agreement. If a research faculty member accepts a fractional instructional teaching appointment, the school will arrange to reduce the percentage of the faculty member's research appointment to the appropriate fractional level, with a corresponding reduction in his or her compensation.

When evaluating the teaching done by a research faculty member, as described above, the school will apply the same criteria the unit uses in evaluating the teaching of instructional faculty.

PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS

Oversight of the Initial Appointment Process

The chair of the department is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates at the rank of research investigator, assistant research scientist, and assistant research professor for their department. The department chair or search committee chair is directly responsible for contacting a minimum of three (3) professional references provided by the candidate before salary negotiations and/or a contingent offer is provided.

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates at the rank of research associate scientist, research scientist, research associate professor and research professor across the departments. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development does not review the candidate's materials nor does s/he make a recommendation regarding appointment. The department chair or search committee chair is directly responsible for contacting a minimum of three (3) professional references provided by the candidate before salary negotiations and/or a contingent offer is provided.

The Office of the Provost and the Office of the Vice President for Research appointment guidelines detail procedures for obtaining approval to extend an offer for appointment to the rank of associate research scientist, research scientist, research associate professor or research professor. These detailed materials must be submitted to the Office of the Provost (research professor) and Office of the Vice President for Research (research scientist) prior to extending an offer. Following review by the Provost, the President and/or the Vice President for Research the lead office will inform the dean of the decision.

Process

The chair of the department who is primarily responsible recommends candidates for a specific rank and term of appointment and forwards their credentials to the human resources office.

If the recommended rank is research associate scientist, research scientist, research associate professor or research professor the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the department chair identify at least two (2) senior faculty members at or above the rank being considered who are preferably in the department and on the same track as the candidate. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Together with the department chair the two (2) senior faculty members will form the review committee and

will each independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review regarding the quality and productivity of the candidate justifying the appointment at the specified rank using the school's appointment criteria.

Note: Executive Committee members are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the Executive Committee.

Documents and Credentials Required for Executive Committee Review

All candidate documents noted below are to be submitted in Word format except publications and teaching evaluations. Documentation used for evaluation of an appointment at the level of research investigator should include the following:

1. Letter of recommendation from the department chair, to include:
 - a. A description of the appointment in the context of the field and describing the candidate's qualifications. This should include a brief description of the process used to identify the candidate.
2. Curriculum vitae of the candidate – with indication of the last time it was updated
3. A research statement from the candidate summarizing his/her research activity, the importance of his/her work in an area of programmatic interest to the School of Nursing, expected role within the School of Nursing, and other university activities in teaching, service and administration.
4. A list of all external research support with complete details of budget and sponsorship, and a statement of the candidate's role in each project.
5. A minimum of two (2) letters of recommendation. These should normally include the candidate's PhD advisor and (if appropriate) postdoctoral advisor. If these are not among the letter writers, an explanation of their exclusion should be included. Letters may be either internal or external.
6. If appropriate, a statement from the principal investigator(s) who will be providing salary support for the candidate indicating support for specific rank and term of appointment.

The department chair will evaluate these materials and, if supported, forward the appointment request for approval to the Executive Committee, which will review and make a recommendation to the dean who will write the letter of appointment.

Documentation used for evaluation of an appointment at the level of assistant research scientist, associate research scientist, research scientist, research assistant professor, research associate professor or research professor should include the following:

1. Letter of recommendation from department chair, to include:
 - a. Proposed rank, effective date, and term of appointment.
 - b. Substantive description of candidate's work and significant contributions to the field demonstrating that the candidate meets the criteria for the rank sought in regards to teaching, research, and service.
 - c. Description of the appointment in the context of the field and the specific needs of the school.

- d. Candidate's strengths in relation to the department's instructional and/or research objectives and the role of the candidate in meeting the needs of the program.
 - e. Summary of the search committee's report and evaluations from faculty regarding the candidate's visit and presentation.
 - f. Summary of oral references contacted.
2. Curriculum vitae of the candidate – with indication of the last time it was updated.
3. Publications – Three (3) to five (5) copies of the candidate's best work/ publications (usually peer-reviewed papers), with emphasis on the most recent or most representative since appointed or promoted to current rank within the University of Michigan School of Nursing.
4. Evidence of teaching experience and performance (for research associate professor and research professor candidates):
 - a. Teaching statement from the candidate
 - b. Explanation of the teaching evaluation system and where the candidate ranks quantitatively in the system. Summaries of evaluations involving ratings as well as student comments can be included; similarly, summaries should be provided for peer evaluations and clinical evaluations, if forms are used for these
5. Evidence of research experience and performance:
 - a. A list of all external research support with complete details of budget and sponsorship, and a statement of the candidate's role in each project.
 - b. A research statement from the candidate with a statement of impact of his/her research/scholarly work to be the first short paragraph of the statement.
 - c. Summarizing his/her independent research activity, the importance of his/her work in an area of programmatic interest to the School of Nursing, expected role within the School of Nursing, and other university activities in teaching, service, and administration.
 - d. If appropriate, a statement from the principal investigator(s) who will be providing salary support for the candidate indicating support for specific rank and term of appointment.
6. A service statement from the candidate.
7. Provide a list of a minimum of three (3) professional references (all ranks) with relevant contact information.
8. Letters of recommendation (for assistant research scientist and research assistant professor candidates only) - Three (3) letters of endorsement/evaluation should accompany the proposal:
 - a. All reviewers must be at or above the rank of associate professor or research associate professor (or equivalent).
 - b. At least one (1) letter must be from an external reviewer.
 - c. Reviewers should include the candidate's PhD supervisor and, if relevant, the postdoctoral advisor.
 - d. The letters should include statements regarding the quality, originality, and significance of the candidate's research as well as a description of research in progress. The statement should also include reasons for

believing the candidate will continue to develop as an effective researcher and scholar.

9. List of names of external reviewers (for research associate professor, research professor, associate research scientist and research scientist candidates only) – The candidate will submit no more than three (3) names of arm’s length external reviewers* who may be willing to provide recommendations upon inquiry to the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development and the department chair. It is possible that an additional two (2) arm’s length external reviewer names will be requested from the candidate but should not be supplied unless requested. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided that includes (see ‘Recommended External Reviewer’ form):
 - a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
 - b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer’s position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
 - c. Selection rationale

The candidate may also suggest up to two (2) names with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not be asked to provide letters of recommendation. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individuals.

* All external reviewers must be “arm’s length” and be at or above the rank of the appointment being considered and from schools of similar stature. Emeriti and adjunct faculty are not eligible to serve as external reviewers. Research track candidates can have research and tenure track reviewers. The University of Michigan policy states that arm’s length reviews should come from individuals outside the present institution of the candidate and from individuals who have not worked or trained with the candidate at other institutions. Close collaborators, present or former advisors/mentors/teachers/supervisors, present colleagues, and close friends are not allowed. Co-authors or major research collaborators are only allowed if it has been more than 10 years since they have worked with the candidate. Letters from persons who have served on a candidate’s thesis or dissertation committee are not considered “arm’s length.” When both an outside reviewer and the candidate are members of the same large cooperative/research group that publishes abstracts and manuscripts with an expanded number of co-authors, the outside reviewer can be considered an “arm’s length” reviewer if s/he and the candidate have not personally interacted in the research effort (the absence of a direct collaboration must be documented in these cases). The reviewers should be individuals in the relevant field who can critique a candidate’s work and scholarly contributions and be able to provide a truly evaluative and unbiased assessment. The reviews of greatest value are from people who may be unknown to the candidate but have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications.

The candidate will submit names of three (3) arm’s length external reviewers to the department chair. The department chair with possible input from the two (2)

senior faculty members and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewers' names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development can add or remove names from the combined list and will approve the initial list, determine who should be contacted for external review letters and will send letters of request to the external reviewers. The finalized list of external reviewers who will be contacted for agreement to review and write a recommendation letter, have agreed or not agreed to provide a recommendation, and the subsequent recommendations received by the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development will be held confidential for use only during the appointment review process; and no contact between the external reviewer and the candidate should take place.

Review by the Internal Review Committee (for associate research scientist, research scientist, research associate professor or research professor only):

Once all external review letters have been received and the candidate's dossier is complete, it will be given to the review committee for their evaluation and recommendation. The review committee, including the department chair will each conduct independent written reviews of the material. The department chair will coordinate and arrange a meeting of the review committee to discuss their completed reviews, including the external reviewer assessments, and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise. The written reviews of the review committee and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature. All recommendation letters should reflect a candid review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that arose through the review process, include comments from all external reviewer recommendations, address any areas needing improvement and distill to a clear recommendation. All independent recommendation letters will be included in the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee for review and vote.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the ['Internal Reviewer Policy'](#).

Review by the Dean and Executive Committee:

The dean and the Executive Committee shall conduct a review of the candidate dossier and the independent recommendations of the review committee members including the department chair. During its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the review committee members, including the department chair to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. During this time, the dean and the Executive Committee may also return a recommendation to a review committee member with specific instructions for further review. The dean and the Executive Committee will then finalize their review and vote on their recommendation. The final School of Nursing decision on the recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absences of all other parties. The HR Office and the Dean's Office will ensure that all required elements are submitted to the Provost's Office, if applicable.

Appointments to the titles of research assistant professor and assistant research scientist are made by the dean with the approval of the university. Recommendations for appointments of associate research scientist, research scientist, research associate professor and research professor will be forwarded to the vice president for research. Appointments of research associate professor and research professor also require the approval of the provost. The dean will include a letter of support for the appointment and identify expected sources of salary funds.

ANNUAL REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

Preface

Review and promotion are never automatic, nor do they simply depend on length of service or degree obtained. These actions require the recommendation of candidates based on demonstrated merit and specific skills and abilities, which are commensurate with the needs of the School of Nursing. Budgetary constraints, program changes, and shifts in student enrollment are factors affecting reappointment. The university endeavors to recognize distinguished performance by adequate increase in salary and by early promotion. It is expected that members of the research track will become more effective researchers and scholars with experience. Therefore, qualifications for review and promotion are progressively more exacting at each rank.

Annual Review for All Research Track Faculty

The vice president for academic affairs encourages each school/college to make a formal review of faculty member's activities each year. This is regarded as particularly helpful in the case of probationary, non-tenured faculty. The department chair conducts internal annual performance reviews of faculty members. The faculty member has an opportunity to submit material relevant to the evaluation, which documents the individual's accomplishments in regard to academic and professional responsibilities as well as contributions to the broader goals of the school and the university via the faculty

productivity report. Decisions regarding reappointments or non-reappointments are communicated to the faculty member according to established guidelines.

The School of Nursing utilizes a faculty productivity report form to capture and evaluate a faculty member's activities over the past academic year and goals for the future academic year, including activities related to diversity, equity, and inclusion, and disruptions caused by COVID-19. Please contact your department for a copy of this report template.

Yearly, each faculty member is expected to prepare and submit this report along with a copy of his or her updated curriculum vitae. The department chair conducts a review of performance, prepares a summary evaluation, and provides a qualitative rating for each faculty member, taking into account academic rank and workload assignment and meets with each faculty member to review performance goals. These finalized reports are submitted to the HR Office and shared with the Dean's Office.

Faculty may use the "Additional Faculty Comments" box on the Faculty Productivity Report Form (Private) to briefly describe (no more than 300 words), how their productivity during the current academic year may have been affected or influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty can describe any areas of impact, including scholarship, teaching, and/or service activities. The description of COVID-19 related influences can remain broad, and faculty are not expected to provide sensitive information, but should capture the reason for the disruption. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- How research productivity was greatly reduced due to laboratory or research unit closure, or shelter-in-home requirements for the research team due to the COVID-19 pandemic
- Having to provide dependent care during the COVID-19 pandemic
- How they or their immediate family required care due to COVID-19 infection
- That they were called to full-time clinical practice during the COVID-19 pandemic

End-of-Term Review for the Initial Appointments of Research Scientist Track and Research Professor Track Faculty

For all research track appointments, the intent of the end-of-term review is to enable decision-making related to reappointment and/or non-reappointment; to assess the progress of research track faculty members; and to provide a recommendation to the Executive Committee for review and decision. If the end-of-term review is successful, the faculty member will be reappointed for another term-limited period and is expected to go for promotion review no later than the fourth year for research investigators and the sixth year all other ranks. If the review is not successful, written notice as well as a terminal year will be given to the faculty member. The final determination of a specific term of appointment/re-appointment will be made at the discretion of the dean based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee. Progression on the research tracks is

expected at the ranks of research investigator, research assistant professor and assistant research scientist (unless classified as term-limited), and is strongly encouraged, but not mandatory at the ranks of research associate professor and associate research scientist.

Additionally, the review aims to help faculty members and their chairs to strengthen academic achievement and productivity during the remainder of the appointment period. The review is an aid for faculty members and department chairs to assess a faculty member's cumulative development, provide guidance for future directions, and support for present directions where possible. The review is not as substantial as that for promotion but is more extensive than the usual annual evaluation conducted by the department chair. The end-of-term review is one (1) of several ongoing evaluations for faculty members and should not in any way constrain or influence the formal reviews for promotion. Participation in the end-of-term review process is required.

Oversight of the End-of-Term Review Process:

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of end-of-term review activities for all candidates across the departments in conjunction with the department chair.

Responsibility for facilitating the progress of faculty toward promotion rests with the department chair. The department chair is responsible for ensuring that fair and equitable evaluation of research, scholarship and service are conducted annually and communicated to the faculty member. The Executive Committee believes a mentoring process is most helpful for individuals as they progress in their careers. However, mentor-mentee relationships emerge voluntarily from situations of mutual benefit to both parties and such relationships cannot be mandated or assigned. The department chair is in a position to advise the faculty member of the qualifications and procedures for promotion and review as well as to determine the candidate's readiness for promotion.

Timing of the End-of-Term Review:

Typically, the review will be conducted and completed during the research track faculty member's third year of appointment. (Note: in the case of budgetary reasons for non-reappointment, the candidate would not be asked to go through an end-of-term review.)

The professorial research track faculty member up for end-of-term review should submit a formal notice to his/her department chair and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in writing by February 1 in the faculty member's third year in appointment. The notice will acknowledge that the faculty member will submit his/her materials in accordance with the procedures contained in these guidelines for end-of-term review. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will use this notice to begin the

end-of-term review process. A successful end-of-term review will be required before a research track faculty member can apply for promotion review.

Documents to be Submitted by Candidate for Review

1. No later than the last Thursday of April by 12 p.m. the faculty member will submit the following materials via Box, and candidate access will be removed as of that day and time:
 - a. Up-to-date curriculum vitae – with indication of the last time it was updated.
 - f. Self-evaluation – A narrative to include the candidate's: 1) teaching statement (if applicable); 2) statement of impact of their research/scholarly work to be the first short paragraph of their research statement; and 3) service statement and that addresses the candidate's plans for development; a summary of evidence of teaching contributions and performance (if applicable). Also, include a separate summary teaching table listing scores on key questions (Q1, Q2, Q4, Q199, Q217, Q 230, Q891, Q1631, Q1632, and Q1633) from the course evaluations form (E & E forms); the actual instructor with comments report (E & E forms) for each course taught; and a supervisory teaching list including doctoral, master's and undergraduate supervision and role for each, and plans for development and work for the next several years (if applicable), were the appointment to be renewed. The narrative statement should not exceed five (5) pages. It should be single-spaced, in Word format, with 1-inch margins, 11-point font size in Times New Roman font. A limit of five (5) or fewer pages of additional tables and figures may be used to summarize data.
 - b. Evidence of excellence in research (limit of five (5) pages)
 - c. Copies of no more than three (3) representative publications (or those in press) since appointment to a professorial rank within the University of Michigan School of Nursing.
 - d. Additional materials as may be relevant to the review; for example, copies of unpublished papers and annual review documents by the department chair of the faculty member.

Process for Review

Submission Requirements:

All faculty will abide by and comply with all submission deadlines. Missed deadlines will halt the process and will jeopardize the candidate's status in the School of Nursing. Only in extreme extenuating circumstances, extensions may be considered upon request to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development from the candidate.

Prior to the submission deadline of materials, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will send out three (3) email reminders to the candidate, copying the department chair or associate dean:

- The first reminder will be sent two (2) weeks prior to the submission deadline;
- The second reminder will be sent one (1) week prior to the submission deadline; and
- The third reminder will be sent the day prior to the submission deadline.

All required materials are due by the submission deadline. Required materials not submitted by the deadline will halt the process and render the candidate ineligible for review during the current cycle.

As end-of-term review is mandatory, candidates who fail to submit required review materials by the submission deadline will be provided a terminal year. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair via email that the review process has been halted and that the faculty member will receive a formal notice of non-reappointment letter under separate cover, and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office. A meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to discuss the notice of non-reappointment.

Internal Review Committee Selection:

With input from the candidate, the department chair will identify one (1) senior faculty member above the candidate's current rank and preferably on the same track as the candidate within the School of Nursing and/or another school/college at the University of Michigan to conduct the review. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Candidates will be informed of the name of their senior. The candidate may also suggest one (1) name with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not to be asked to serve as an internal reviewer. The associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individual. Together with the department chair, the senior faculty member will form the internal review committee, and each will independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review of the candidate's work using the School of Nursing's promotion criteria. The department chair will notify the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in writing of the senior faculty member selected for each candidate by 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of March.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Note: Executive Committee members and associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the dean and the Executive Committee.

Timetable of Review

Review by the Internal Review Committee:

Candidates' materials will be made available to the internal review committee members via Box on or by May 1.

The internal review committee members will each conduct independent written reviews of the candidate's materials. The department chair will coordinate and arrange a meeting with the senior faculty member to discuss his/her completed draft written recommendation and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise. The senior faculty member will be given an opportunity after the meeting to revise his/her draft letter of recommendation. All recommendations will include an assessment of the faculty member's progress to date at the expected level of performance for the rank including strengths and weaknesses, the potential for continuing development, any areas needing improvement and a clear recommendation for renewal or non-renewal, along with a rationale. The independent written reviews of the senior faculty member and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature.

The internal review committee will finalize their letters of recommendation and submit their recommendations to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development. The recommendations will be made available to the dean and Executive Committee via Box by 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of August. At that time, candidates will be informed in writing by the department chair of the recommendation going forward to the Executive Committee. The candidate will have an opportunity to respond to the internal review committee, including the department chair's recommendation going forward and to submit supplemental material prior to their final dossier going to the Executive Committee.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

All independent recommendation letters, the candidate's response/rebuttal and any supplemental material will be provided to the Office Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development to be included into the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee via Box by the second Monday of September.

Upon dean and Executive Committee written decision/notification to the department chair noted in the 'Review by the Executive Committee' section, a meeting will be arranged by the department chair with the faculty member to

discuss reappointment or non-reappointment for another appointment period, progress to date, appropriateness of workload and support available from the department or the Office of Research based on the Executive Committee notification/decision. Before the meeting, the department chair will provide a copy of the Executive Committee's written decision to the candidate for review. The department chair will confirm with the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development in writing that the meeting between the faculty member and department chair has taken place. A copy of the review committee and Executive Committee review letters will remain on file and made available to the Executive Committee at promotion review.

Review by the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee will review all of the faculty member's materials and evaluate the recommendations of the review committee including the department chair to make a recommendation of renewal or non-renewal of appointment to the dean. In the course of its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the internal review committee members (including the senior internal reviewer and/or the department chair) to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. The Executive Committee will finalize their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean by the end of December. The faculty member and department chair will be notified in writing of the dean and Executive Committee decision at that time.

Note: The final School of Nursing decision on each recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absence of all other parties.

Mock Review

The Executive Committee offers mock reviews to all Research Associate Professors/Associate Research Scientists. A mock review is available at any time other than the year of application for promotion to Research Professor/Research Scientist but is encouraged in the third year after appointment or promotion to Research Associate Professors/Associate Research Scientists. The mock review is intended to facilitate the most optimal presentation of a faculty member for promotion to Research Professor/Research Scientist. The mock review is voluntary and is advisory in nature. To encourage these reviews, only a full curriculum vitae and publications since appointment to rank are required. A self-evaluation of teaching (for research professor track), research, and service accomplishments may also be submitted. No copies of the written summary by the Executive Committee will be placed in the School's files.

Promotion of Research Faculty

General guidelines for expected time in rank prior to promotion consideration:

Rank	Years in Rank
Research Investigator	2-4
Assistant Research Scientist	6
Associate Research Scientist	4-6
Research Scientist	-
Research Assistant Professor	6
Research Associate Professor	4-6
Research Professor	-

*More information can be found on the Office of Research website - <https://research.umich.edu/policies-on-appointments-and-promotions-for-research-scientist-track/>.

Oversight of the Promotion Process

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development is the overall coordinator of promotion activities for all candidates across the departments in the School of Nursing. In fall (September/October) of each year, in conjunction with the Dean's Office, the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will publish the annual calendar for promotion dates. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development does not review the candidate's dossier nor makes a recommendation regarding promotion.

Initiation for the Review for Promotion

By February 1, faculty applicants will declare in writing their intent to apply for promotion in September of the following academic year to the chair of their department and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. The written intent will include whether the faculty applicant has a joint faculty appointment (with effort or dry (0%)) on the tenure track, clinical track and/or research tracks in another unit on campus and the relevant unit contact information of the faculty administrator (i.e., department chair, associate dean, director, etc.).

The candidate, the department chair and associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development reviews the request and, if agreement is reached, the applicant follows the procedures for compiling and submitting the necessary materials. In the event that the immediate supervisor does not approve the request, an explanation will be given in writing to the candidate. The faculty member is free to proceed with the application for promotion if the candidate is convinced of his/her readiness for promotion consideration.

Responsibility for facilitating the progress of faculty toward promotion rests with the department chair. The department chair is responsible for ensuring that fair and equitable evaluation of teaching, research, and service are conducted annually and communicated

to the faculty member. The Executive Committee believes a mentoring process is most helpful for individuals as they progress in their careers. However, mentor-mentee relationships emerge voluntarily from situations of mutual benefit to both parties and such relationships cannot be mandated or assigned. The department chair or associate dean is in a position to advise the faculty of mentorship opportunities, (e.g., names within the School of Nursing or on University of Michigan campus, professional development workshops, etc.) recognizing faculty may need multiple mentors (teaching, service, scholarship), and qualifications and procedures for promotion and review as well as to determine the candidate's readiness for promotion. The recommendation for promotion developed by the review committee, including the department chair must address the candidate's readiness for promotion and be applicable to the rank for which the applicant is to be considered.

Submitting a Dossier before Mandatory Review or Customary Promotion Review Cycle

The following policies pertain to faculty who submit a dossier for promotion during a review cycle prior to their mandatory review or customary promotion review timeline. The intent of this policy is transparency, fairness across tracks and fairness across individuals in review processes. This school policy and procedure is complementary to existing university and school policies and do not displace policies and procedures for mandatory review/timeline extensions.

Research track faculty (research assistant professor, assistant research scientist) who have completed a successful end-of-term review and who have been reappointed may opt to submit their dossier for promotion during a review cycle prior to their mandatory review. All research professor and research scientist track promotions require the review of the Vice President for Research and the relevant Provost. Research Professor and Research Scientist track faculty are also reviewed by the Office of the Provost prior to submission to the Board of Regents. Promotion to associate research scientist and research scientist require the approval of the Vice President for Research and do not require the Office of the Provost's approval. For all research professor and research scientist track faculty, only one university-level review for promotion from assistant to research associate professor or research associate scientist is allowed. A maximum of two reviews at the school-level for promotion are allowed per candidate.

Should research track faculty (research assistant professor, assistant research scientist) choose to submit a dossier for promotion cycle prior to their mandatory review, and if after the Executive Committee review, a positive/supportive recommendation is rendered, the candidate's dossier along with a positive/supportive recommendation will be advanced for university level review. However, if after Executive Committee review, a negative/non-supportive recommendation is rendered, a negative vote will be recorded in the meeting minutes. The Dean may offer the faculty candidate the option to withdraw their dossier and to resubmit it at the time of their mandatory review. If offered and accepted, the dossier will not be forward to the Vice President for Research/Provost Office for university level review. However, if there is no offer for second review or if candidate refuses to withdraw their dossier (if offered), then the dossier along with a negative recommendation will be forwarded to the Vice President for Research/Provost

Office for review. If after university level review, a negative/non-supportive recommendation is rendered, the school will follow the processes of The University of Michigan Office of Research (UMOR). The school promotion process for research track faculty align with that of UMOR. <https://research.umich.edu/research-resources/research-faculty-affairs/>.

Faculty applicants who declare their intent to apply for promotion review in an earlier promotion cycle (a promotion cycle before their mandatory scheduled review) can withdraw their intent to apply for promotion between February 1 and 12 p.m. the last Thursday of March. The withdraw of intent to apply for early promotion review can be done once, unless exception approval from the department chair, dean and Executive Committee is obtain and the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development is consulted.

Questions regarding the process, should be directed to the department chair and/or the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development.

Documents to be Submitted by Candidate for Review

The applicant should submit documentation and evidence of strengths in teaching, research, and community service, selecting areas applicable for the rank for which the candidate is applying. All documents must be in portrait format with the exception of course evaluation forms (E & E forms). Excel spreadsheets are not permissible as part of dossier materials. Documents required by all candidates:

1. If appropriate, a statement from the principal investigator(s) who will be providing salary support for the candidate indicating support for specific rank and term of appointment.
2. Up-to-date curriculum vitae – with indication of the last time it was updated.
3. A list of all external research support with complete details of budget and sponsorship and a statement of the candidate's role in each project.

Documents for assistant research scientist and assistant research professor candidates only:

4. A letter from the candidate's supervisor during his/her time as a research investigator or assistant research scientist. This letter should describe both the candidate's accomplishments as a researcher and the growth that the candidate has evidenced while a research investigator or assistant research scientist.
5. Copies of recent and/or key publications.
6. A list of at least three (3) additional persons from whom letters of evaluation/recommendation may be obtained, with full contact information and a brief indication of why each individual would be an appropriate reviewer.
 - All reviewers must be at or above the rank to which the candidate requests promotion.

- At least one (1) letter must be from an external reviewer and include a description of the individual's credentials.
 - Reviewers should include the candidate's PhD advisor and, if relevant, the postdoctoral advisor (if not the candidate's supervisor during their time as a research investigator or assistant research scientist).
7. A research statement from the candidate summarizing his/her research activity, the importance of his/her work in an area of programmatic interest to the School of Nursing, expected role within the School of Nursing, and other university activities in teaching, service and administration.

Documents for associate research scientist, research scientist, research associate professor and research professor only:

8. List of names of external reviewers – The candidate can submit no more than three (3) names of arm's length external reviewers* who are willing to provide recommendations upon inquiry need to be furnished by the candidate. It is possible that an additional two (2) arm's length external reviewer names will be requested from the candidate but should not be supplied unless requested. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):
- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
 - b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
 - c. Selection rationale

The candidate may also suggest up to two (2) names with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not be asked to provide letters of recommendation. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individuals.

The department chair in conjunction with the candidate's advocate and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewer names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will select individuals from the list provided by the candidate but reserves the right to ask other reviewers because of

inability of the listed reviewers to complete the reviews or for other reasons. In such cases, the promotion applicant will be informed.

* All external reviewers must be “arm’s length” and be at or above the rank of the appointment being considered and from schools of similar stature. Emeriti and adjunct faculty are not eligible to serve as external reviewers. Research track candidates can have research track and tenure track reviewers. The University of Michigan policy states that arm’s length reviews should come from individuals who have not worked or trained with the candidate at other institutions. Close collaborators, present or former advisors/mentors/ teachers/supervisors, present or former colleagues, and close friends are not allowed. Co-authors or major research collaborators are only allowed if it has been more than 10 years since they have worked with the candidate. The reviewers should be individuals in the relevant field who can critique a candidate’s work and scholarly contributions and to be able to provide a truly evaluative and unbiased assessment. The reviews of greatest value are from people who may be unknown to the candidate but have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications.

9. Publications – Five (5) pieces of the candidate’s best work/publications (usually peer-reviewed papers) are included, with emphasis on the most recent or most representative since appointed or promoted to current rank within the University of Michigan School of Nursing. The candidate provides notes on each of the five (5) papers. This is a single page per paper that explains why the candidate selected the paper, any unique or seminal contribution of the paper to nursing science, the impact factor, and journal significance and in the case of multiple-authored papers, provides an explanation of the candidate's contribution. The citation survey may be used to demonstrate impact of some or all of the papers.
10. Self-evaluation - A narrative summarizing evidence that the candidate meets the criteria for the rank sought. To include the candidate’s:

- a. Teaching statement (including contributions to interdisciplinary and interprofessional teaching, if relevant),
- b. Research statement (including a statement of impact of the candidate’s research/scholarly work to be the first short paragraph of the statement; and contributions to interdisciplinary and interprofessional research, if relevant), and
- c. Service statement.

The narrative statement should not exceed five (5) pages. It should be single-spaced, in Word format, with 1-inch margins, 11-point font size in Times New Roman font. A limit of five (5) or fewer pages of additional tables and figures may be used to summarize data.

11. Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness (for research associate professor and research professor only):
 - a. Summary teaching table (use the Provost Office approved template) listing scores on key questions (Q1, Q2, Q4, Q199, Q217, Q 230, Q891, Q1631, Q1632, and Q1633) from the course evaluation forms (E & E forms).
 - b. Instructor with comments report (E & E forms) for each course taught.

- c. Supervisory teaching list including doctoral, masters and undergraduate supervision and role for each.
 - d. Additional materials in line with the teaching portfolio recommended by the Provost Office are encouraged.
12. Other materials may be requested by the review committee and/or Executive Committee.

Process for Review

Submission Requirements:

All faculty will abide by and comply with all submission deadlines. Missed deadlines will halt the process and will jeopardize the candidate's status in the School of Nursing. Only in extreme extenuating circumstances, extensions may be considered upon request to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development from the candidate.

Prior to the submission deadline of materials, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will send out three (3) email reminders to the candidate, copying the department chair or associate dean:

- The first reminder will be sent two (2) weeks prior to the submission deadline;
- The second reminder will be sent one (1) week prior to the submission deadline; and
- The third reminder will be sent the day prior to the submission deadline.

All required materials are due by the submission deadline. Required materials not submitted by the deadline will halt the process and render the candidate ineligible for review during the current cycle.

Mandatory Promotion Review

Candidates undergoing a mandatory promotion review (e.g., research assistant professor to research associate professor, assistant research scientist to associate research scientist) who fail to submit required review materials by the submission deadline will be provided a terminal year. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair or associate dean via email that the review process has been halted and that the faculty member will receive a formal notice of non-reappointment letter under separate cover, and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office. A meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to discuss the notice of non-reappointment.

Non-Mandatory Promotion Review

Candidates undergoing a non-mandatory promotion review who fail to submit required review materials by the submission deadline will not be reviewed during the current review cycle in which they declared their intention. The candidate will have an opportunity to declare their intention to apply for promotion during the next review cycle. The Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will notify the candidate and department chair or associate dean via email that the review process has been halted and will thereafter notify the dean and HR Office.

Advocate Selection:

During the month of February, the candidate and the department chair select an advocate and then notify the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development of the faculty member selected by February 28. The advocate should be a senior faculty member at or above the rank being considered who knows the candidate and his/her scholarship and can work closely with the candidate to assemble the necessary credentials.

Internal Review Committee Selection:

With input from the candidate and potentially the advocate, the department chair and the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will identify at least two (2) senior faculty members at or above the rank being considered, preferably in the department and on the same track as the candidate within the School of Nursing and/or another school/college at the University of Michigan by 12 p.m. the last Thursday of March. The faculty selected should be capable of reviewing the candidate's quality of work but should not have any conflicts of interest (e.g., co-authorship (unless the relationship is a student lead paper, the result of service to a committee or is a school led task force, or is the result of a team or multi-author paper and the faculty member is not the first- or senior-author), mentorship, supervisory relationships or submitted/funded grants) with the candidate. Candidates will be informed of who their internal reviewers are. Together with the department chair, the two (2) senior faculty members will form the review committee. Each member of the review committee will independently conduct an unbiased, rigorous, peer review of the candidate's work using the School of Nursing's promotion and tenure criteria. The candidate may also suggest up to one (1) name with reason provided of those whom they would prefer not to be asked to serve as an internal reviewer. The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and department chair will decide if it is appropriate to exclude the individual.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the [‘Internal Reviewer Policy’](#).

Note: Executive Committee members are not eligible to conduct reviews at the unit level. Any requests for exception to this policy need to be discussed and approved by the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the Executive Committee.

List of External Reviewers:

By April 1, the candidate will submit the names of no more than three (3) arm's length external reviewers to their department chair. The department chair, in conjunction with the candidate's advocate and after discussion with the candidate, will determine appropriate arenas to seek additional arm's length external reviewer names from and will submit names of an additional seven (7) school recommended arm's length external reviewers to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development by April 1. External reviewers outside the U.S. will not be solicited. Complete identifying information regarding these reviewers should be provided by the department chair that includes (see 'Recommended External Reviewer' form):

- a. Full name, title, mailing address, telephone number, and email address
- b. Short paragraph on each reviewer indicating the reviewer's position at the peer institution, fields of expertise, important contributions and standing in the discipline, and appropriateness of the reviewer to provide input
- c. Selection rationale

The associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development can add or remove names from the combined list and will approve the initial list by May 1.

The finalized list of external reviewers who will be contacted for agreement to review and write a recommendation letter, have agreed or not agreed to provide a recommendation, and the subsequent recommendations received by the associate dean for faculty affairs and faculty development will be held confidential for use only during the promotion review process; and no contact between the external reviewer and the candidate should take place.

When all candidates have declared their intention to apply for promotion and/or tenure and department chairs have submitted the combined list of external reviewers to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development, the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development will receive the compiled lists and determine who should be contacted for external review letters and will send letters of request to the external reviewers in May or June.

All external review letters need to be received at the School of Nursing by the last Friday of August. External letters will be sent to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development in the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development to compile into the candidate's dossier. Once all external review letters have been received and the candidate's dossier is complete, it will be given to the review committee for their evaluation and recommendation.

Candidate's Dossier to the Office Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development:

The application for promotion and candidate's completed dossiers to be reviewed, should be submitted to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development via Box by no

later than the last Thursday of May by 12 p.m. The candidate's access to the Box site will be removed after 12 p.m. on the last Thursday of May.

Timetable of Review

Careful and intensive review of all credentials of candidates by the School, including external recommendations, requires advanced planning and a timetable, which will ensure that the recommendations for promotion are received by the provost, president and the regents in advance of their scheduled meetings each year.

Review by the Internal Review Committee:

Review committee members, including the department chair will each conduct independent written reviews of the candidate's materials that includes completing the 'External Reviewer Summary of Comments Worksheet' as required by the Provost Office; will meet as a group to discuss their completed written reviews, and have the opportunity after the group meeting to revise their letter of recommendation before final submission of the letters to the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development no later than by 12 p.m. on the second Thursday of October. The department chair will coordinate and arrange the meeting of the review committee to discuss their completed reviews including the external reviewer assessments and will assist with any criteria and/or clarifying questions that arise before the October deadline. The independent written reviews of the review committee and department chair do not have to agree and will be addressed to the dean on letterhead and with internal reviewer signature. All recommendation letters should reflect a candid review of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate that arose through the review process, include comments from all external reviewer recommendations, address any areas needing improvement and distill to a clear recommendation. All independent recommendation letters as well as the consolidated 'External Reviewer Summary Comments Worksheet' will be included in the final dossier and forwarded to the dean and Executive Committee. Candidates will not be informed of the recommendations from the review committee or department chair to the dean and Executive Committee.

It should be noted that candidates have the ability to submit new and relevant information (such as funded grants, accepted publications, etc.) at any time in the process.

For information about documenting unit-level service expectations by serving as an internal review committee member, see the '[Internal Reviewer Policy](#)'.

Review by the Dean and Executive Committee:

The dean and the Executive Committee shall conduct a preliminary review of all candidate dossiers and the independent recommendations of the review committee members including the department chair and the consolidated 'External Reviewer Summary of Comments Worksheet' in November. In the course of its deliberations, the dean and the Executive Committee may invite the review committee members including

the department chair to an Executive Committee meeting to discuss their reviews and recommendations of the candidate. The dean and Executive Committee will then draft a preliminary recommendation to the candidate by December that includes gaps as well as requests for clarification and/or additional information. Candidates have until January 1 to respond to the preliminary recommendation and provide the required clarifications and/or additional information. During this time, the dean and the Executive Committee may also return a recommendation to a review committee member with specific instructions for further review.

The Executive Committee will finalize their review and vote on their recommendation to the dean by February 1. At that time, candidates will be informed in writing only of the recommendation going forward and a meeting will be arranged between the candidate, the dean, and the department chair to go over the outcome of the review. The candidate has an opportunity to submit supplemental material prior to their file going to the Provost's Office. The final School of Nursing decision on each recommendation is the prerogative of the dean and the Executive Committee, and the decision shall be made in the absence of all other parties.

The HR Office and the Dean's Office will work together to ensure that all required elements are submitted to the Office of the Vice President for Research and/or the Provost's Office by the deadline.

Review by University Officials:

As with appointments, all recommendations of the dean and the Executive Committee concerning re-appointment and promotion, in order to be implemented as recommended, require the approval of the appropriate university officials.

Recommendation to the Vice President for Research and/or Provost by February 1:

Recommendations for associate research scientist and research scientist ranks require the approval of the vice president for research. Recommendations for research associate professor and research professor ranks require the provost and/or president's approval. The provost forwards all recommendations for promotion to the research associate professor and research professor ranks to the Regents for final action on recommendation for promotion.

Notification of Final Decision:

Notification of candidate - The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the recommendation of the Executive Committee. At a later date, the dean will notify the candidate and her/his chair of the recommendations of the vice president for research and/or the provost and, if applicable, of the final decision of the Board of Regents. The candidate may request clarification of these decisions in conference with the dean or the Executive Committee.

Note: If successfully promoted, the final determination of a specific term of appointment/re-

appointment will be made at the discretion of the dean based on the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

DENIAL OF PROMOTION AND THE APPEAL PROCESS

Preface

The establishment of a probationary period and a commitment to make a decision regarding reappointment and/or promotion in advance of the end of the probationary period, as well as the implementation of an annual review and evaluation are efforts to: 1) create a fair system with effective appointment, promotion and tenure policies and practices, and 2) promote the recognition of the achievement of all who meet the criteria and standards for promotion.

Denial of Promotion and the Appeal Process

An applicant for reappointment or promotion who is not satisfied, on procedural grounds, with the decision of the dean and the Executive Committee may initiate a formal appeal of the promotion review. The appeal procedure follows the established lines of administrative organization within the School of Nursing and the University of Michigan. The School of Nursing grievance procedures are presented in Appendix A.

LECTURER FACULTY

APPOINTMENTS TO LECTURER POSITIONS

The title of lecturer is accorded those persons whose special skills are needed by the school on a part-time or full-time basis. This appointment may serve the purpose of meeting temporary needs by individuals for whom another rank may not be appropriate. Appointment as a lecturer is not a tenure-track appointment and is considered supplemental. The appointment as a lecturer is appropriate for part-time teaching positions.

All activities and procedures related to lecturer positions (appointment, review, renewals, etc.) are governed by the Lecturers' Employee Organization (LEO) contract, which can be found on the University of Michigan Human Resources website at <https://hr.umich.edu/working-u-m/my-employment/faculty-human-resources-services/contracts>.

PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS

Oversight of the Initial Appointment Process

The chair of the department or associate dean for undergraduate studies for the Undergraduate Program is the overall coordinator of initial appointment review activities for candidates to the title of lecturer for their department or program. The chair of the department or associate dean for undergraduate studies forwards candidates' credentials to the HR Office. The department chair, associate dean for undergraduate studies and/or search committee chair is directly responsible for contacting a minimum of three (3) professional references provided by the candidate before salary negotiations and/or a contingent offer is provided.

Documents and Credentials Required for Submission to the Executive Committee

All candidate documents noted below are to be submitted in Word.

1. Letter of recommendation from department chair, to include:
 - a. Proposed lecturer title, effective date, and term of appointment.
 - b. Description of the appointment in the context of the field and the specific needs of the school.
 - c. Candidate's strengths in relation to meeting the needs of the program.
 - d. Summary of oral references contacted.
2. Curriculum vitae of the candidate – with indication of the last time it was updated.
3. Evidence of teaching experience and performance:
 - a. Teaching statement from the candidate.
4. Provide a list of a minimum of three (3) professional references with relevant contact information.

ADJUNCT FACULTY

APPOINTMENTS TO ADJUNCT POSITIONS

Persons whose primary responsibilities lie outside the university or in another capacity within the university may be appointed on a part-time basis as adjunct professors, associate professors, assistant professors, clinical professors, clinical associate professors, clinical assistant professors, clinical instructors, research professors, research associate professors, research assistant professors, research scientists, associate research scientists, assistant research scientists, or lecturers, in order to supplement the instructional program. Appointment and promotion criteria shall be consistent with those for regular instructional ranks to the extent applicable. Adjunct appointments are recommended by the appropriate department chair (in conjunction with the associate dean for undergraduate studies for Clinical Faculty Adjunct Network (CAFN) adjunct appointments)), reviewed by the dean and the Executive Committee, and are approved by the university. Appointments as adjunct faculty are normally on a three-year, annual, or shorter basis, and are without tenure.

All adjunct ranks are available, appointment processes apply, and promotions are possible within the adjunct line.

Adjunct Professor

The title of adjunct professor is accorded the individual who has met the requirements for appointment as an adjunct associate professor and who has established:

1. Sustained record of excellence in teaching, including experience with advanced students;
2. Reputation among the candidate's colleagues and peers throughout the nation and preferably internationally for outstanding and continuing achievements in their field of expertise;
3. Continuing record of recognized professional accomplishments.

Adjunct Associate Professor

The title of adjunct associate professor is accorded the individual who has met the requirements for appointment as an adjunct assistant professor and who has established:

1. A record of excellence in teaching;
2. A reputation among colleagues for outstanding achievements and nationally recognized contributions in their field of research;
3. An admiral record of professional service.

Adjunct Assistant Professor

The title of adjunct assistant professor is accorded the individual who has:

1. Earned a doctoral degree;
2. Demonstrated creative competence in teaching.

Adjunct Clinical Faculty

Appointments to this title are made when an individual's primary employment responsibilities lie outside of the School of Nursing. This title indicates that the individual is working for a limited portion of his/her time (part-time) involving clinical supervision. Adjunct appointments may be made at any clinical faculty rank but must be consistent with the individual's professional stature and are without tenure.

Adjunct Research Faculty

Appointments to this title are made when an individual's primary employment responsibilities lie outside of the School of Nursing. This title indicates that the individual is working for a limited portion of his/her time (part-time) on a research project housed within the School of Nursing. Adjunct appointments may be made at any research faculty rank but must be consistent with the individual's professional stature and are without tenure.

VISITING FACULTY

APPOINTMENTS TO VISITING FACULTY POSITIONS

Individuals whose primary responsibilities lie within another institution of higher education or who responsibilities with the university will be explicitly temporary, may be appointed as visiting professors, visiting associate professors, visiting assistant professors, visiting instructors, visiting clinical professors, visiting clinical associate professors, visiting clinical assistant professors, or visiting clinical instructors in order to temporarily supplement the instructional program. A visiting faculty member will be appointed to the rank, which is consistent with that held in the home institution. Visiting appointments are recommended by the appropriate department chair, the dean and the Executive Committee, and are approved by the university. Appointments as visiting faculty are for one (1) year or less and may be extended only under unusual circumstances. These appointments are without tenure.

Visiting Research Faculty

Appointments to visiting titles are made for scholars visiting the university for a predetermined time (one-year or less) to conduct research. Their primary appointment would typically be at another academic/research institution and they would be expected to return to that position. Visiting appointments may be made at any research faculty rank but must be consistent with the individual's professional stature. These appointments are without tenure.

APPENDIX A: GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND OVERVIEW

The grievance procedures provided by the university and each of its units must be fair to all parties concerned – faculty members, research faculty, administrators, and the university. The procedures should be reasonably uncomplicated, follow the established lines of administration within the School of Nursing and the University of Michigan, include informal as well as faculty review processes, and allow for timely redress where appropriate.

II. INSTRUCTIONAL, CLINICAL, AND RESEARCH FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

A. Access to the Grievance Procedure

1. Eligible grievants. The procedure applies only to those instructional faculty who are tenured, tenure-track, or clinical faculty; research faculty, including those in the research scientist track and those in the research professor track. “Clinical faculty” includes those faculty on the clinical track and those faculty who are credentialed through the Faculty Practice Plan and whose primary responsibility is practice. The procedure does not apply to supplemental faculty such as adjunct faculty or visiting faculty.
2. Grievable matters. These procedures are available when there is a charge that the school or a department has reached a decision or action concerning a faculty member’s conditions of employment that violates University policy or is otherwise manifestly unfair. The school is, and the departments are, expected to rely scrupulously and consistently on decision-making procedures that are fair and commonly known. Grievances brought pursuant to this document apply only to a decision or action concerning a specific individual or specific individuals, including those adversely affected by application of a policy or standard operating procedure, written or unwritten. The procedure does not apply to decisions regarding employment, including tenure or promotion decisions, merit pay determinations, and decisions regarding clinical competence/patient safety, that are based solely and exclusively on judgments about professional performance. But this grievance process does apply to claims that the procedure followed in making such decisions failed to follow University policies and procedures or was otherwise manifestly unfair, or that the decision violated standards of nondiscrimination contained in Regental Bylaw 14.06. Although these procedures may be used to challenge the procedures used in the formation of school or university policy, they shall not be available for challenges to the desirability of such policies, nor are they available for claims that are patently frivolous or without merit, based upon an interpretation of the facts most favorable to the grievant.

B. Informal Review Process

The grievant must first be permitted to discuss informally and privately any grievance relating broadly to employment with those who made the decision that gave rise to the complaint. If the matter is not resolved, the grievant must then have access to a formal grievance system in which there is faculty participation.

Informal Discussion:

1. A grievant must first try to resolve a dispute by discussing it informally with the person (or persons) who made or affirmed the disputed decision or who has the authority to provide redress. (The grievant is reminded that the formal review must be initiated within 90 days as stated in C.1.)
2. Efforts to resolve a dispute informally may continue despite the commencement of formal review under Section C., below.
3. If the results of this discussion are not satisfactory, the faculty member will meet with the person at the next administrative level (department chair, assistant dean, associate dean, and/or dean) to present and discuss her/his problem or complaint.
4. In instances when the faculty member proceeds to discuss an unresolved problem with the dean, the informal process ends following the dean's review and decision.

C. Formal Review Process

1. Grievant's request. Within 90 calendar days of the date the grievant first knew or could reasonably have been expected to know of the decision or event that gave rise to the grievance a Faculty Grievance Form (FGF) will be filed and submitted to the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR) and the SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM). The DAHR shall transmit a copy of the FGF to the named respondent(s), with copies to the dean.
2. Parties. The parties to a grievance are the faculty member who initiates the grievance and the decision-maker(s) responsible for the contested decision or action. Both the grievant and the respondent shall abide by all the procedures set forth here, shall participate in good faith, and shall respect the confidentiality of the process. Communication concerning the proceedings shall be limited to parties, advisers, mediators, and any others for whom information is strictly necessary for the legitimate effectuation of the process.
3. Composition of the Board. A Grievance Hearing Board (Board) shall be established to handle each grievance filed by a faculty member.
 - a. A Faculty Grievance Hearing Panel (FGHP) is established from whose members each Grievance Hearing Board will have two (2) selected randomly. The FGHP will consist of tenured faculty members, elected by the school. FGHP members will serve single staggered terms of three years. FGHP members may not serve consecutive terms. Vacancies will be filled in the same manner except that if the unexpired term is one (1) year or less, the replacement member shall serve an additional three-year term. Within 10 working days of receiving the notice of a pending grievance, the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR) and the SACUA Faculty Grievance

Monitor (FGM) shall meet or communicate and choose by lot two (2) persons from the FGHP to serve on the Board. Those two (2) members shall come from different academic units and neither shall come from the school of the grievant. The DAHR and the FGM may then agree on one (1) of the two (2) members as a chair for the Board or leave the choice between those two (2) of the Board itself.

- b. The third member of the Board shall come from the school from which the grievance arises. The school shall elect three-to-five tenured faculty as potential Board members. Only one (1) of the three-to-five members elected will serve on the grievance. Members will serve a three-year term. Within 10 working days of receiving the notice of a pending grievance from the DAHR, the grievant and the respondent shall each nominate three members from this list of potential Board members. Both parties shall rank their preferences and transmit their choices to the DAHR and the FGM. Within 5 working days, the DAHR and the FGM shall jointly determine the one (1) nominee most favored by both parties. If there is a tie amount the choices, the DAHR and the FGM will jointly resolve the tie by lot.
 - c. At any time prior to the first meeting of the Board, the grievant and the respondent have the option of agreeing upon any three tenured University faculty members from any academic unit, whether or not members of the FGHP, to serve as the Board. In this instance, the remaining provision regarding Boards will apply.
4. Board Election Process.
- a. Faculty Grievance Hearing Panel (FGHP). To prepare a slate of qualified candidates for the general faculty election, the Executive Committee in consultation with the department chairs will bring forth a proposed ballot to the faculty at large for approval. The ballot shall contain at least three candidates for the one (1) vacant position. The slate will not include faculty members who hold administrative positions in the school, such as assistant or associate deans or department chairs. During the general election held each May, votes will be collected and tallied under the supervision of the Executive Committee. The election results listing names from highest to lowest vote count will be forwarded to the dean. The dean will forward the elected faculty member's name to the Office of the Provost. The Office of the Dean will maintain the historical record of the faculty serving on the FGHP and retain election ballots on file for three years.
 - b. Grievance Hearing Board (Board). To prepare a slate of qualified candidates for the general faculty election, the Executive Committee in consultation with the department chairs will bring forth a proposed ballot to the faculty at large for approval. The ballot shall contain at least five candidates for the three-to-five vacant positions. The slate will not include faculty members who hold administrative positions in the school, such as assistant or associate deans or department chairs. During the general election held each May, votes will be collected and tallied under the supervision of the faculty serving on the Executive Committee. The dean will forward the elected faculty member's names to the Office of the Provost. The Office of the Dean will maintain the

historical record of the faculty serving on the Board and retain election ballots on file for three years. A vacancy in membership can be filled by an alternate from the most recent ballot. Should an alternate not be available a special faculty election will be held to fill the member vacancy for the designated period of time.

- c. A member of a Board shall recuse her/himself if s/he has significant personal or professional associations with either party and any member shall be excused with the concurrence of both the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR) and the SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM), if either the grievant or the respondent objects for sufficient cause to the person's serving.

5. Board's Decision to Review the Case.

- a. The Board shall meet within 15 working days after it is established to first determine whether the complaint is within the authority or jurisdiction of the grievance process. The Board may dismiss the grievance without a hearing if it concludes, on the bases of the FGF and all other materials before the Board that there are no grounds for deciding the case in the grievant's favor. If the Board decides the complaint is not grievable, the grievant shall have 15 working days to appeal this decision to SACUA or a faculty body designated by SACUA. The appellate body shall have 20 working days to resolve the issue. Its decision shall be final.
- b. Within 10 working days of its first meeting, the Board shall advise the grievant, the respondent, the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR), the SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM), and the dean in writing whether it will proceed with a hearing. If the Board decides the complaint is not grievable, or the grievance is to be dismissed, it shall state its reasons in writing. If the Board decides to proceed, it shall specify in a written notice to the parties, the DAHR, the FGM, and the dean when and where the hearing will be held and what issues are to be addressed by the parties. The hearing shall be scheduled within 30 working days or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

6. Parties' Rights. The Board shall ensure fair procedures for the parties in any hearing. Specifically, the grievant and the respondent shall have the following rights:

- a. To be accompanied before the Board by advisers, who may be attorneys. The advisers may advise their clients but may not participate directly in the hearing.
- b. To appear and present their cases, and to cross-examine the witnesses and challenge the evidence presented by the other party.
- c. To have access to all relevant evidence, testimonial and documentary, except confidential evaluations and evidence that would infringe upon the privacy interests of third persons. Upon a party's request, the chair of the Board shall be allowed to examine relevant confidential files of an academic unit or department and to provide the Board with a summary of their contents as they relate to the grievance, giving due consideration to protecting the confidential aspects of the material.

- d. The Board may call its own witnesses and obtain relevant documents, subject to the parties' right of access and the confidentiality restrictions above.
 - e. Testimony before the Board is voluntary. If any witness declines to testify about any issue, however, the Board may draw appropriate inferences about what the testimony would have been based on the refusal to testify. Any such inference should be carefully supported and explained by the Board.
 - f. Hearings before the Board shall be private and confidential, attended only by the principal parties and their advisers, if any; the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR) or designee; and the SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM) or designee. Unless otherwise directed by the Board for good reason, witnesses shall attend only while testifying. The Board chair may invite appropriate observers or others having a substantial interest in the outcome of the case, if both the grievant and the respondent agree.
 - g. Portions of the hearing at which testimony is taken and evidence presented shall be recorded verbatim, but the recording may be by voice recorder. Both the grievant and the respondent may also record the hearing.
 - h. The Board shall deliver only to the grievant and the respondent a written provisional decision within 20 working days after the completion of testimony and argument. The content of the provisional decision shall remain confidential and may not be shared at any time with any other person except those entitled without special agreement to participate in the hearing or advise the parties.
 - i. The grievant and the respondent shall have 10 working days after receipt of the provisional decision to submit a written response to the Board.
 - j. The Board shall consider any responses to the provisional decision and shall deliver its final decision within 10 working days after receipt of those responses. Both the provisional decision and the final decision shall include a summary of the testimony, factual findings, conclusions with reasons the grieved decision or action was or was not violated of University policy or otherwise manifestly unfair, and, if appropriate, a proposed remedy. Decisions of the Board shall be by majority vote. The reasons for any dissent must be stated in a written minority opinion. The Board shall present the final decision only to the grievant, the respondent, the dean, the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR), the SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM), and, if appropriate, the department chair.
 - k. Although the Board does not have executive authority, the parties are expected to respect and accept the findings, conclusions, recommendations, and any proposed remedy of the Board as the considered judgment of a competent and disinterested peer group. The Board may recommend actions that do not fall within the respondent's authority, but recommendations addressed to those who are not parties should not give rise to the same expectations.
7. SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM). The SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM) is a tenured faculty member who is appointed annually by SACUA to monitor all grievances. In addition to the functions assigned elsewhere, the FGM and

the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR) shall have the following responsibilities:

- a. Jointly to provide or arrange for the training of FGHP members, and especially those designated as Board chairs, in the conduct of a hearing and the preparation of a formal written decision.
 - b. Jointly or separately provide objective information to either the grievant or the respondent or both about the operation of the grievance procedure.
 - c. Separately to monitor the processing of the grievances and to report to the dean, or the provost if the dean is a respondent, any delay or other failure to comply with specified procedures or Board directives or decision on appeal.
 - d. Separately to maintain confidential records of all grievance proceedings, including copies of all written documents that are submitted and of any written transcript of testimony that is prepared. If there is a single voice or electronic recording of the testimony, the DAHR shall maintain custody of it after the Board renders a final decision, but shall allow access as needed by the parties, the FGM, and the University authority to whom any appeal is addressed.
 - e. Jointly to provide redacted reports or summaries of cases, with party names and all identifying details deleted, to University administrators and faculty members, scholars, and others with legitimate interest in knowing about the proceedings.
8. The dean, or the provost if the dean is a respondent, shall take prompt action to remedy any undue delay in the processing of grievances or other failure by any party to comply with specified procedures or Board directives or decision on appeal.

E. Formal Appeals Process

1. Party's request. The grievant or the respondent or both may submit a written appeal of a final decision by a Grievance Hearing Board (Board) within 20 working days of the receipt of the decision. If the dean is not a respondent, the appeal shall be submitted to the dean. If the dean is a respondent, the appeal shall be submitted to the provost. The written appeal must include the nature of the complaint, the facts supporting it, and the remedy sought.
2. Decision(s). An appeal shall be decided on the record made before the Board. When necessary in the judgment of the person deciding the appeal, the proceedings may be remanded to the Board to receive new information. A remand for new information shall be granted on the request of the grievant or respondent only on a showing that the information could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have been presented when the record was made. The remand shall set the times for further Board proceedings, including any revised final Board decision. The findings, conclusions, recommendations, and proposed remedy, if any, of the Board shall be presumed valid on appeal, and shall be rejected or modified only because of substantial errors of fact or interpretation of University regulations.
3. Written Response. The dean or provost shall respond in writing within 30 days of receiving the appeal, stating the action to be taken and the reasons for it. The response shall be transmitted to the grievant, the respondent, and the members of the

Board, the Director of Academic Human Resources (DAHR), and the SACUA Faculty Grievance Monitor (FGM).

III. FACULTY OMBUDS

The School of Nursing Faculty Ombuds attempts to solve issues within the School of Nursing and is elected for a three-year term by the governing faculty and is a tenured, senior faculty.

Faculty have access to this person, or the Central Faculty Ombuds:

<http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/10/10.D.html>

<http://www.provost.umich.edu/faculty/handbook/10/10.E.html>

In 1989, the Senate Assembly established a task force to review the faculty grievance procedures. The task force found that most disputes were settled by informal rather than formal methods. As a consequence, the task force recommended that the university develop an office of University Ombuds to which all faculty would have access. After consultation with the then provost, the decision was made to establish a faculty ombuds position in the 14 schools and colleges without existing programs, with the Faculty Senate Office serving as coordinator.

The faculty ombuds in the schools and colleges are faculty members who have been elected or appointed. The ombuds assist within the schools and colleges by providing information and counseling on the issue facing the individual. The ombuds help to review and explore the various options available for handling concerns, problems, and complaints. Training for faculty ombuds includes techniques in conflict management and mediation.

A. What is the Role of the Faculty Ombuds?

Faculty ombuds serve the college or school by providing confidential and impartial assistance that supports good faith efforts to resolve issues. The primary function of the ombuds is to protect the interests and rights of faculty and administrators from injustices or abuses of discretion, from unnecessary delay and complication in administration of rules and regulations, and from inconsistency, unresponsiveness, and discrimination at all levels of the university's operations and programs.

The ombuds position exists to help increase the probability that satisfactory and suitable resolutions can be reached informally and to reduce the likelihood that difficult situations might lead to formal grievances. The ombuds work does not supersede regular university grievance or appeal procedures, but supplements and enhances them.

B. What Type of Issues Do Faculty Ombuds Handle?

The nature of concerns that faculty ombuds are likely to assist with may pertain to retention and tenure, promotion, salary, working conditions and general climate issues, academic freedom, credit for work done, and harassment by peer or senior colleagues, students or staff. Although the faculty ombuds do not have the power to change rules, regulations, policies, procedures, or the behavior of others, they do advocate for just and fair treatment. They have an understanding of the current policies and practices

regarding promotion, tenure, salaries, and the unit's specific grievance procedures as well as training in conflict management and mediation.

C. What If There Is a Reason I Don't Want to Use the Ombuds in My Unit?

Because of supervisory, mentoring, or other relationships there will be times when some faculty members will feel more comfortable working with the Central Faculty Ombuds. Assistance and counsel from Mediation Services for Faculty and Staff <http://www.umich.edu/~mediate/> is also available.

D. Other resources

<https://facultyombuds.umich.edu/resources/>

APPENDIX B: CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURES

PREFACE

Potential conflicts of interest (COI) and commitment (COC) are inevitable where faculty are engaged, as they ought to be, with actors and institutions outside the University; nor are these potential conflicts necessarily problematic. Rather, the University allows and encourages faculty to engage in outside activities and relationships that enhance the University's mission. It is nevertheless important that faculty disclose any potential conflicts of interest or commitment as soon as they arise so that they can be evaluated and, if necessary, managed or eliminated.

The School of Nursing (UMSN) policy is to ensure disclosure of possible COIs and COCs and provide a process to discuss and manage possible issues and concerns or for a faculty member to ask a group of colleagues if a situation poses a COI or COC. Obviously, the UMSN policy must be consistent with the University of Michigan conflict of interest and conflict of commitment policy.

A potential COI arises when external ties might appear to bias a faculty member's judgment in performing his or her University obligations. Specifically, a potential conflict of interest exists whenever personal, professional, commercial, or financial interests or activities outside of the University have the possibility (either in actuality or in appearance) of (1) compromising a faculty member's judgment; (2) biasing the nature or direction of scholarly research; (3) influencing a faculty member's decision or behavior with respect to teaching and student affairs, appointments and promotions, uses of University resources, interactions with human subjects, or other matters of interest to the University; or (4) resulting in a personal or family member's gain or advancement at the expense of the University. For purposes of subsection (4), family members include spouse, domestic partners and/or dependents (SPG, 201.65-1).

A potential COC arises when a faculty member engages in external relationships, activities or assumes external commitments that might appear to compromise his or her ability to fulfill the responsibilities of his or her University position. Such a situation exists when a faculty member's external relationships or activities have the possibility (either in actuality or in appearance) of interfering or competing with the University's educational, research, or service missions, or with that individual's ability or willingness to perform the full range of responsibilities associated with his or her position (SPG, 201.65-1).

OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND

The University Standard Practice Guide (SPG) 201.65-1 on COI and COC was revised July 15, 2005. As part of that revision, each operating unit was asked to draft policies and procedures for educating, managing, and mitigating potential conflicts of interest and conflict of commitment situations. To assist in developing a School of Nursing (UMSN) policy, process, and set of

practices, the University has provided several resources upon which a framework can be constructed. These include University policy and practice guidelines, University by-laws, and our own School practices. The framework developed is consistent with the University policies and approved by the governing faculty.

Central to the University's SPG [201.65-1](#) is the University's "commitment to basic values of transparency, integrity of scholarship, and independence as it pursues its mission to create, preserve, and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, and public service." The University policy also states the following: "Given that the University of Michigan allows and encourages outside activities and relationships that enhance the mission of the University, potential conflicts of interest and commitment are inevitable. Outside activities should not, however, interfere with an individual's University obligations. Faculty must not use their official University positions or influence to further gain or advancement for themselves, parents, siblings, spouse or partner, children, dependent relatives, or other personal associates, at the expense of the University." The SPG goes on to say that "All actual and potential conflicts of interest or commitment must be disclosed to a designated University official; evaluated; and if found to be significant, eliminated or managed..." The concept is to have COI/COC situations reviewed and recommendations made by a group of colleagues.

EXAMPLES OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND CONFLICTS OF COMMITMENT (not meant to be exhaustive)

Situations that create a potential conflict of interest might include:

- A faculty member may accept honoraria and speaker fees. If a substantial time commitment is required, however, a potential conflict of commitment may arise.
- A faculty member may incur reasonable meal and travel expenses that are reimbursable either by the University or by external organizations. However, a faculty member may not accept reimbursement that amounts to a gift of substantial value from people or institutions that contract with the University.
- A faculty member may not accept a gift of substantial value (including services) from a University student member—unless there is a family relationship or the equivalent. This rule applies to gifts from people or institutions that contract with the University.
- A faculty member may not require students to contribute services or money to institutions or activities external to the University in which the faculty member has an interest, or to himself/herself personally. Where a student is given an opportunity through a faculty member to become associated with an external project, the student should receive compensation or credit—and it must be clear to the student that the association is at her/his option.
- A faculty member may not represent that the unit or the University supports the mission of an external person, institution, or organization.

GIFTS

A potential conflict exists when a vendor or student, current or potential, gives a gift to a faculty member. General University policy prohibits employees from accepting any gift of substantial value from vendors or from students (Regents' Bylaw 2.16). In line with general University policy and IRS regulations, an employee may not accept any gift from a vendor or from a student. Additionally, it is never appropriate to receive a gift of any value that is given with the expectation of receiving some favor or benefit in return.

The existence of a potential conflict of commitment must be evaluated in light of the minimum time and effort requirements applicable to the specific faculty member in question.

- Faculty members with 50% or more appointments owe their primary professional commitment to the University. A commensurate commitment of time and intellectual energy must therefore be devoted to activities that further the University's mission as described in the School of Nursing Faculty Handbook.
- Other part-time faculty, including adjunct faculty, similarly owe the University time and effort commitments commensurate with their appointments.
- Even where obligations to the University are met, a faculty member may not engage in business activities that compete with or otherwise undermine the University's mission.

For other examples, see Appendix I.

DISCLOSURE, EVALUATION AND MANAGEMENT OF POTENTIAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST AND CONFLICTS OF COMMITMENT

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts

- Each faculty member will promptly disclose all actual or potential COI/COC to their appropriate Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee (SPG, 201.65-1) online via the M-Inform Disclosure System, and will raise the disclosure to the person to whom they report.
- All faculty must make disclosures as part of their annual performance review each year.
- Recurring or long-term commitments incurred by faculty must be included in the annual report of each faculty member to the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee.
- Disclosure need not be made where there is no conflict of the general nature cited above. However, disclosure should be made whenever there is any question whether the incident falls within the situations described above.

Management of Potential Conflicts

Upon disclosure of a potential conflict of interest or commitment online via the M-Inform Disclosure System, the HR Office will forward the disclosure to the appropriate Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee for review. The Dean, Associate Dean,

Chair, Supervisor or Designee will evaluate the extent of the potential conflict to determine whether it is a conflict that needs to be managed or eliminated. The Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee may ask the faculty member to provide additional information or documentation if necessary (see Appendix II for guide). The Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee may determine that further consultation with the Director of Human Resources is necessary before a determination is made. In all cases, the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee will provide the manner in which the conflicts were resolved to the Director of Human Resources.

In response to a disclosure, and after consultation with the faculty member, the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee may determine that no action is necessary. In this case, this would be communicated to the Director of Human Resources. If the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee determines that management of the potential conflict is necessary, the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee will develop a conflict management plan in consultation with the faculty member and the Director of Human Resources for the School of Nursing. The plan may include, but is not limited to:

- Disclosing the potential conflict to appropriate sources inside and outside the University;
- Modifying or limiting the faculty member's duties to minimize or eliminate the conflict;
- Reducing the faculty member's appointment to accommodate the outside interest or activity;
- Securing the faculty member's agreement to modify or suspend outside activity, use of University resources, or other activities that create the potential conflict; or
- Prohibiting certain outside activity as inconsistent with the faculty member's obligations to the University.

In some circumstances, evaluation of the potential conflict will require consultation and processing by central administration offices. For example, centralized processing is necessary in the following circumstances:

- Where disclosure involves sponsored research or technology transfer, by the Office of the Vice President for Research;
- Where there may be a conflict between two academic units, by the Provost's Office;
- Where legal obligations or potential liability may be involved, with the Office of Vice President and General Counsel, and
- Where the disclosure involves a purchase of goods or services, by Purchasing.

Record-Keeping and Issues of Confidentiality and Privacy

The Director of Human Resources will make all reasonable efforts to preserve the privacy and confidentiality of personal information revealed as part of this process. The Office of Human Resources will keep a record of action on disclosures made under

this policy, in part to develop a consistent practice of treating similar cases alike. All records will be kept in a secure electronic file (on the shared drive for the Office of Human Resources and in M-Inform) accessible only to the Director of Human Resources, Assistant Dean for Administration, and/or Dean. In some circumstances, the University is required to disclose potential conflicts to people within or outside the University (e.g., federally funded research project, disclosure to the federal government is required). The University may be legally required to disclose information in response to the requests made under the Michigan Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) (<https://foia.vpcomm.umich.edu/>). Should any other individual have a legitimate educational or business reason to access the confidential records, only the Director of Human Resources, Assistant Dean for Administration and/or Dean may authorize access to the electronic file, provide copies, or provide oral or written summaries. Where possible, the individual to whom information is disclosed is required to maintain at least the same level of confidentiality as provided for the original information.

Any employee who becomes aware that the Director of Human Resources, Assistant Dean for Administration or Dean has provided or may have provided unwarranted access to conflict documentation or information, as defined in this policy, should inform the relevant superior for appropriate action.

Dispute Resolution

When a faculty member disputes any decision made in response to the disclosure of a potential conflict of interest or commitment, s/he should first request that the action or decision be re-reviewed by the appropriate Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee and the Director of Human Resources. A faculty member may then dispute any decision by first going to the Executive Committee and the Dean. Following exhaustion of these procedures, the faculty member may dispute any action or decision under this policy in accordance with applicable University Procedures (SPG, 201.65-1). Sponsored research/ technology transfer must be handled in accordance with processes adopted by the University of Michigan Office of Research (UMOR) Conflict of Interest Committees. Other disputes between a faculty member and the unit should be resolved through normal grievance procedures as outlined in the School of Nursing Faculty Handbook.

The School of Nursing COI/COC Dispute Resolution Committee shall consist of three members from the Executive Committee, selected among themselves and approved by the Dean. They shall have two-year staggered terms.

Violations

Any failure to comply with SPG 201.65-1, its procedures, or this implementing policy may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination of appointment in accordance with applicable disciplinary procedures (SPG, 201.65-1). Possible violations that may lead to disciplinary action include, but are not limited to, the following: failure to disclose fully a potential conflict; failure to comply fully with a required conflict

management plan; failure to maintain the confidentiality of conflict documentation and information; and failure to complete any required training or education regarding the policy. In addition, employees covered by collective bargaining agreements shall be subject to the provisions of this policy to the extent that they do not conflict with the relevant collective bargaining agreement. School of Nursing and University procedures governing faculty misconduct shall apply.

If the Dispute Resolution Committee and Dean report that the faculty member has engaged in a conflict of interest/commitment and the situation has not been resolved, the Dean will work with the Provost's Office, the University of Michigan Office of Research (UMOR), and the Office of the Vice President and General Counsel to determine appropriate responses.

POLICY REVIEW AND REVISIONS

The Director of Human Resources will review all actions taken under this policy and will make recommendations to the Dean and the Assistant Dean for Administration regarding any needed revisions to the policy or any need for increased education, as needed. Any changes or revisions to the policy will be recommended to the Dean and discussed with faculty. Final changes will be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Executive VP for Academic Affairs for further review and approval and to the President for final adoption. This policy will be on file in the Provost's office.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Upon hiring into the School of Nursing, every faculty member shall receive a copy of the School of Nursing's Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Policy. Upon receipt, each faculty member must sign a statement that s/he has received a copy of the policy. A hard copy of this signed statement is maintained as part of the employee's personnel file. Annually, all faculty members are required to address COI/COC in their annual review with their Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee and as they arise online via the M-Inform Disclosure system. The School of Nursing's COC/COI policy will be included in the new faculty orientation each year at both the School and department/unit levels and faculty will receive reminders from their Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Supervisor or Designee annually at the first department/unit faculty meetings of the academic year.

Faculty members are also required to complete the online tutorial to ensure that they understand the topic of conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment and the basic elements of what the University expects of them in this regard. Note that the tutorial is a University overview and does not cover the details of the School of Nursing's specific policy. Faculty should fully read this document to ensure compliance with School of Nursing policies. Additional information from the University of Michigan Tutorial on COI/COC can be found at https://www.provost.umich.edu/programs/COI_COC/faculty/index.html.

GOVERNING POLICIES

This policy implements [SPG 201.65-1](#), *Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment*, incorporates [SPG 201.65-1](#) in its entirety, and includes all elements required under that SPG. Implementation of [SPG 201.65-1](#) within the School of Nursing requires compliance with other University policies and procedures, including all Regents' Bylaws and SPGs, as well as with any relevant external rules of professional conduct and applicable law. Relevant policies, procedures, rules, and law include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Regents' Bylaw [2.16](#), regarding gifts to University employees
<http://www.umich.edu/~regents/bylaws/bylaws02.html#16>;
- Regents' Bylaw [5.12](#), regarding outside employment of University faculty
<http://www.regents.umich.edu/bylaws/bylaws05b.html#3>;
- Regents' Bylaw [5.13](#), regarding governmental elected or appointed service
<http://www.umich.edu/~regents/bylaws/bylaws05b.html#4>;
- Regents' Bylaw [5.14](#), regarding leaves of absence
<http://www.umich.edu/~regents/bylaws/bylaws05b.html#5>;
- SPG [201.23](#), regarding appointment of individuals with close personal or external business relationships;
- SPG [201.65](#), regarding employment outside the University;
- SPG [201.85](#), regarding special stipends for work performed for other University units, the payment of honoraria, and the payment of travel expenses;
- SPG [500.01](#), [601.03-2](#), and [601.11](#), in particular to the extent that they address copyright and other appropriate use of University resources, such as the libraries, office space, computers, secretarial and administrative support staff, and supplies;
- University of Michigan Office of Research (UMOR) [Policy](#) on Conflict of Interest (COI) <http://research-compliance.umich.edu/conflict-interest-coi>;
- Michigan Compiled Laws [§ 15.321](#) et seq., regarding contracts of public employees with their employers; and
- Where applicable, the current collective bargaining agreement for the graduate student employee or faculty member.

In the event of any inconsistency between this policy and other University or external requirements, those other requirements will prevail. In interpreting this policy, the Dean, the Assistant Dean for Administration, and the Director of Human Resources should be attentive to preserve the principle of academic freedom of speech and thought. In addition, policy administrators will make every reasonable effort to preserve confidentiality and protect the privacy of all parties in the course of investigating and managing a potential conflict of interest or commitment.

REFERENCES

Conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment. (2005). Retrieved from
<http://spg.umich.edu/policy/201.65-1>

Policy statement on the integrity of scholarship and procedures for investigating allegations of misconduct in the pursuit of scholarship and research. (1994). Retrieved from <http://spg.umich.edu/policy/303.03>

Outside employment. Retrieved from <http://www.umich.edu/%7Eregents/bylaws/bylaws05b.html#3>

COC/COI – APPENDIX I

Additional Examples of Potential Conflicts of Commitment

- Any work external to the department potentially raises a question of conflict of commitment. However, any such work that contributes to the scholarly or educational goals of the department is permitted or is not a conflict.
- For full-time faculty, other professional work is permitted to a total of thirty-two hours a month if it does not interfere with the minimum expectations outlined above. If there is any question about whether a commitment falls within these categories, or if there is any potential for interfering with the minimum expectations above, the matter should be disclosed.
- A full-time faculty member may not establish a business that competes with the University.
- Part-time faculty need only disclose commitments that have the potential for interfering with their minimum obligations to the University.

Other examples of Conflicts of Interest

- Benefit by an investigator from the financial outcome of their research.
- Referrals to a business in which the faculty member or a member of his or her immediate family has an interest.
- Interest in a business that competes with the U-M.
- Publishing or presentation of research without disclosure of the investigator's related financial interest.
- Allowing University responsibilities to influence or benefit a company in which the investigator or a member of the investigator's immediate family has an interest.
- Participation in technology development in a company where the investigator or a member of the investigator's immediate family has an interest.
- Executive participation in a start-up company.

COI/COC – APPENDIX II

Suggested Questions for the Resolution Process

Because the University specifically requires that all potential conflicts of interest and commitment be disclosed to appropriate University authorities and that efforts to mitigate possible conflicts are in place, the subgroup investigating disclosures should be sure to include in its review this disclosure element. The following are **suggested questions** that could be addressed in the resolution process:

1. Did the faculty member engage in actions that constitute a potential COI/COC?
2. Did the faculty member properly disclose the potential for a COI/COC situation prior to engaging in the activity?
3. If the faculty member did disclose the potential conflict of interest, were the proper precautions put in place in advance to mitigate any possible COI/COC?

4. If the faculty member did not disclose the potential COI/COC and did participate in activities in which there may have been a COI/COC, was there evidence of any harm to any individuals, the school, or the University?
5. If there was harm what are the recommended remedies?
6. If there was harm what are the recommended sanctions for the faculty member?
7. Has this faculty member been made aware of the policy and its possible consequences?
8. When was the last major review of the COI and COC policy with the entire school faculty?
9. Has the school taken proper precautions to ensure that all faculty are aware of their responsibilities relevant to the conflict of interest policy?
10. What is the recommendation of the committee to the school regarding education on the conflict of interest policy for faculty?

APPENDIX C: FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS

Teaching Workload

The expected teaching load for regular, full-time faculty with 100% appointments is as follows:

Tenure track faculty:	12 credits per 9-month appointment
Clinical track faculty – professorial:	18 credits per 12-month appointment or equivalent
Clinical track faculty – instructor:	21 credits per 12-month appointment or equivalent
	18 credits per 9-month appointment or equivalent
Lecturers/supplemental faculty:	12 credits per 4 months (Intermittent Lecturer/Lecturer I), 24 credits per 8-month (Lecturer I/II) and 9-month (Lecturer III/IV) appointments (credit hour equivalent adjustment for administrative work for Lecturer III/IV)

Credit will be given for serving as faculty chair/advisor for PhD students. Faculty receive 0.5 credits per registered student per term for the fall and winter terms, for up to 4 years, and a limit of 3 credits per academic year.

Teaching workload credit also may be allocated for special projects/initiatives and/or other School of Nursing mission-aligned alternative assignments.

Student academic, career, and research advisement at all program levels is expected. Collegial mentorship is expected of all tenured faculty members.

Scholarship Commitment

All full-time, regular faculty members are expected to conduct scholarship and obtain external funding to support scholarship activities.

Full-time, regular faculty who are not engaged in scholarship or in the preparation of scholarship proposals and faculty who show no evidence of scholarship productivity can expect to have additional teaching assignments beyond what is noted above.

When external scholarship funding is obtained for salary support, the total amount of time allocated to scholarship activities must be equal to or greater than the time funded by the sponsor and is negotiated between the department chair and the faculty member.

Service Commitment

All faculty are expected to devote a portion of their time/effort to activities that promote the ongoing development and welfare of the school, the university, the nursing

profession, and the broader communities that they serve. Activities of this nature that engage faculty outside of the university must conform with Regents Bylaws governing outside activities and with university policy pertaining to Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment.

RELEASED TIME FOR SPECIAL INITIATIVES

A given faculty member may have a situation which varies from the customary expectation because of school needs or individual circumstances. Released time is dependent upon the availability of resources and is negotiated between the faculty member and the department chair or associate dean for undergraduate studies.

APPENDIX D: POLICY FOR FACULTY SALARY MERIT PROGRAM

PURPOSE

The University of Michigan School of Nursing Faculty Salary Merit Program is established for the following purposes:

1. To distribute available funds in a manner that supports and reinforces faculty contributions toward attaining school goals
2. To recognize and reward strong performance
3. To encourage exemplary performance
4. To recognize and reward singular outstanding achievements

ELIGIBILITY

All continuing faculty members are eligible for annual consideration in the salary merit program that would generally be effective September 1. The type and amount of any salary increase awarded will depend upon the results of the faculty member's most current evaluation. Faculty must effectively meet expectations for performance and productivity to qualify for a salary increase.

FREQUENCY OF FACULTY EVALUATIONS

All faculty will be evaluated annually.

TYPES OF SALARY INCREASES

There are four (4) types of salary adjustments available: no salary increase (Merit 0), merit increases (Merit 1, Merit 1.5, Merit 2) and exemplary performance bonus.

No Salary Increase

Faculty members who do not meet expectations for performance and productivity will not receive a salary increase.

Merit Increases

All faculty members whose most current evaluation is meritorious as determined by their department chair will be awarded a merit increase, based on available funds. Three levels of merit are possible:

Merit 1 – faculty effectively meeting all expectations for performance and productivity.
Merit 1.5 – faculty effectively meeting all expectations for performance and productivity, while clearly significantly exceeding expectations in some areas of performance and

productivity.

Merit 2 – faculty clearly exceeding expectations for performance and productivity in all areas.

Based upon the amount of funds available for salary increases, the dean will determine the percent of increase for merit. These increases are generally added to the base salary; however, one-time bonuses may also be used based on financial circumstances.

Exemplary Performance Bonus

Faculty members whose performance is exemplary can qualify for an additional bonus beyond their general merit increase in a given year. For the purposes of this policy, exemplary is defined as a model worth imitating; one who “does it all” and “does it all well.” Criteria and examples of indicative behavior are delineated in the table below; to demonstrate exemplary performance, a faculty member must meet all criteria applicable to their workload assignments.

While most faculty are clearly meritorious, it is expected that, due to the level of performance reflected in the designation of exemplary, only a small number of faculty may qualify in any given year, and fewer still would qualify consistently for this bonus. *Faculty members must meet all applicable criteria and receive a Merit 2 rating to be considered.* The examples given in the table below are illustrative and are not intended to be limiting or exhaustive.

Recommendations for an exemplary performance bonus are made by the faculty member's immediate superior. Recommendations will come from and/or be reviewed by the department chairs and recommended to the dean and Executive Committee. Final decisions are made by the dean and Executive Committee.

Criteria	Examples
Embodies desirable characteristics of a high-functioning faculty member.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Sought by colleagues for advice or consultation▪ Mentors other faculty in teaching and/or research▪ Makes quality contribution to multiple levels of the curriculum/programs▪ Performs all role components in a high-quality manner
Excels in <u>all</u> areas of one's workload.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Integrates teaching, research, and service activities to some demonstrable degree
Performance is noteworthy, distinguished, or creative.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Provides major new conceptual direction to a course or program▪ Establishes a clinical application based on their research program▪ Publishes a trend-setting or seminal work in their field

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Makes a significant contribution to curriculum development ▪ Manages a teaching load well AND makes other outstanding contributions, e.g., develops a new course(s) or publishes multiple papers ▪ Obtains significant external funding AND makes other outstanding contributions to education or practice
Affords leadership to major school or university initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provides leadership to a major committee or task force in a <u>significant</u> task. e.g., accreditation report, curriculum development ▪ Provides leadership to a defined group in a <u>new</u> enterprise, e.g., designs/conducts a demonstration project

APPENDIX E: COVID-19 RELATED CLOCK EXTENSION REQUEST INSTRUCTIONS

PURPOSE

In response to an Office of the Provost directive and the School of Nursing community concerns for faculty success, a clock extension request process for eligible faculty related to the COVID-19 pandemic is put forth below.

ELIGIBILITY

Faculty who have successfully completed an end-of-term review and have been reappointed, and who are within their probationary period with a mandatory promotion and/or tenure review scheduled during an upcoming promotion and/or tenure review cycle.

APPLICATION STATEMENT

A written clock extension request should briefly describe (100 words or less) how the COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted the eligible faculty member's research, scholarship, teaching, and/or service activities. The description of COVID-19 related reasons are broad. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- The faculty member's research productivity was greatly reduced due to laboratory or research unit closure, or shelter-in-home requirements for the research team due to the COVID-19 pandemic
- The faculty member had to provide dependent care during the COVID-19 pandemic
- The faculty member or immediate family required care due to COVID-19 infection
- The family member was called to full-time clinical practice during the COVID-19 pandemic

DEADLINES: SUBMISSION, ACKNOWLEDGEMENT, DECISION

Written requests from eligible faculty will be submitted to the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and copied to the appropriate department chair. The School of Nursing Ombuds will be eligible, as a neutral party, to participate.

A. Tenure track faculty within their probationary period who have a mandatory tenure review, scheduled for 2021-2022

Timeline

Application due date:	November 6, 2020
Notification in writing of application outcome:	November 20, 2020
Deadline to submit materials for mandatory promotion and tenure review, if extension is approved:	By 12 p.m. the last Thursday of May, 2022

Deadline to submit materials if extension is not approved:	By 12 p.m. the last Thursday of May, 2021
--	---

B. Tenure track faculty within their probationary period who have a mandatory tenure review scheduled during an upcoming promotion and tenure review cycle

Timeline

Application due date:	February 1
Notification in writing of application outcome:	March 1
Deadline to submit materials for mandatory promotion and tenure review, if extension is not approved:	By 12 p.m. the last Thursday of May in the year of the scheduled mandatory tenure review

C. Clinical track faculty who have completed a successful end-of-term review, are not eligible to request a clock extension as promotion on this track is not mandatory

D. Research professor track and research scientist track faculty within their probationary period who have a mandatory review scheduled during an upcoming promotion review cycle

Timeline

Application due date:	February 1
Notification in writing of application outcome:	March 1
Deadline to submit materials for mandatory promotion review, if extension is not approved:	By 12 p.m. the last Thursday of May in the year of the scheduled mandatory review

Upon receipt, the Office of Faculty Affairs and Faculty Development will acknowledge the date and time of the submitted request. All requests will be reviewed by the associate dean of faculty affairs and faculty development and the dean. If approved, a request for a one-year clock extension due to the COVID-19 pandemic will be applied to the faculty member's probationary clock. Requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis. This is not a blanket clock extension; it is not an automatic extension; and eligible faculty must apply for consideration.

ADDENDUM: IMPACT OF COVID-19 PANDEMIC

OPTION TO INCLUDE A BRIEF ADDENDUM TO DOSSIER

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, which began winter term 2020, faculty may include an addendum to their dossiers (end-of-term review, promotion and/or tenure review) that describes the impact of COVID-19. The brief description (300 words or less; Word format with 1-inch margins, 11-point font size in Times New Roman font) should broadly describe how COVID-19 has disrupted the faculty applicant's research, scholarship, teaching, and/or service activities.

The addendum is not part of the self-evaluation (narrative). The addendum will be included as part of the candidate's dossier materials available for review by the internal review committee, external reviewers (promotion and/or tenure review), the dean and Executive Committee, and the provost and/or vice president for research, president and the regents (promotion and/or tenure review).

In addition, Winter 2020 course evaluations will be shared with faculty, but will be used only for formative (developmental learning) rather than summative (formal evaluation) processes. Evaluations for Winter 2020 will not be considered in promotion and/or tenure reviews, end-of-term review or other formal evaluations. Winter 2020 evaluations will not be reported at the University-level (i.e., not accessible to students through the Atlas tool) but may be reported through the School of Nursing at the discretion of the dean.